

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the DEAN OF WINCHESTER, THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXIII

JULY, 1931

No. 133

EDITORIAL

SOME CURRENT ISSUES

1. THE ETHICS OF SWEEPSTAKES

THE vast sums which have poured into Dublin in recent months in connection with the Irish Hospital sweepstakes have raised issues which have not suffered from any lack of publicity. They are issues both of expediency and of principle; and, though the two series overlap, there is some convenience in regarding them separately. The Church, in virtue both of its duty of moral witness and of its close connection with hospitals, is concerned with both; and it is desirable that we should try to clear our own minds in view of impending legislation. And this is the more necessary, since any attempt which Parliament may make at moderate and sensible legislation is sure of strenuous resistance from the noisiest section of the Press.

It will clear the ground if we say at once that we do not share the view of those who maintain that sweepstakes are always and on principle wrong. Still less, however, we may add, do we agree with those—and they are a very large number—who imagine that doubt as to the ethics of sweepstakes is in some way or other straightened out, and their possible guilt atoned for, by saying that the sweepstakes are “for charity.” The Englishman has an inveterate love of using “charity” to save himself the trouble of thinking; and the result is both to debase his idea of charity and to cloud his sense of right and wrong. Charity covers a multitude of sins, but only when it is really charity, and not cupidity masquerading under that name.

The issue of sweepstakes for hospitals raises particular problems which it will be convenient to consider first. Granted that sweepstakes are not *per se* criminal, is this method of raising money for hospitals likely to benefit them or not? On the short view, it is clear that they do: up to date, that is to say, large sums have accrued to the credit of the Irish hospitals.

Yet, even on this view, the gain has not been a net gain; for the Lord Mayor of Dublin stated, on the occasion of the second sweepstake, that there had been a serious decline in subscriptions to the hospitals, and he appealed to the public not to think that the profits from sweepstakes were meant to take the place of voluntary gifts. But now suppose that the law in regard to sweepstakes is altered, and that they become—as in that case they might—a normal customary method of raising funds for charitable purposes, what will happen? Not only will ordinary subscriptions fall off, but the competition between rival charitable agencies in the promotion of sweepstakes will become so severe that the divisible profits of every particular flotation will steadily diminish. It must be remembered that Ireland has had the field to itself for the last twelve months: but let others enter it, and the hospitals (or any other agencies which adopted this method) would find that they had cut away their most reliable financial support—one, moreover, which rested on strong moral principles—and had substituted for it a wasting asset.

The need of provision for the sick makes it, therefore, imperative that sweepstakes for hospitals, as at present understood, should be strongly resisted. We in England cannot, of course, legislate for the Irish Free State; but there is every reason why Parliament should prevent its citizens from pouring their money into Ireland; and we think that the law should be brought up to date, and should make the sale of tickets in any lottery outside Great Britain a crime punishable with heavy penalties.

A further point arises, however, as to whether sweepstakes, if they are to be allowed at all, could be used *in another way* to assist charitable funds. One of the most hopeful features of hospital finance in recent years has been the growth of contributory schemes, under which members pay threepence or fourpence a week and can claim the right to free hospital treatment. It is a form of voluntary insurance admirably adapted to working-class homes. At the same time these schemes need many more members, if they are to be set on a true economic basis. Is it not worth considering whether the contributors to such schemes might not be regarded as constituting a club, whose members—and they alone—would be entitled to take tickets in any sweepstakes organised by that club? Such an arrangement would appear to require little, if any, alteration in the law; and its effect would probably be to add very considerably to the number of regular subscribers to hospitals.

All this is, of course, dependent on the premiss that sweepstakes are not in themselves antecedently wrong. That view we are prepared to defend, chiefly on the ground that we do not find the arguments on the contrary side convincing; we know of no fundamental moral principle which forbids a man, in Archbishop Magee's words, to "buy a chance." That does not mean, however, that there are no moral issues involved. On the contrary, a course of action, which is not wrong in itself, may none the less be wrong at one time and right at another; right in moderation and wrong in excess; wrong for one person and right for another. The circumstances conditioning the action, that is to say, are among the things which determine its moral quality. And in the case before us the social consequences of sweepstakes are so far-reaching that these issues must be fairly faced.

In principle, the case of sweepstakes seems closely parallel to that of alcoholic drink; they are harmless in moderation, harmful in excess. "Betting is not a sin," it has been said, "but may easily become one": and no one who has had any experience of pastoral or social work can doubt that betting is today more dangerous even than drink to the well-being of society. The effects of excess, moreover, are so similar in the two cases—instability of character, weakness of will, dependence on excitement, ruin of homes—that we may expect methods which have been largely successful in the one case to succeed also in the other. But why is it that drunkenness is far rarer in England today than it was a generation ago? The causes appear to be two; on the one hand, the growth of education, on the other the increased cost of alcoholic liquor. The second has exercised a direct and immediate effect on the quantity consumed. What we have got to do with the gambling menace is to bring the same kind of reforming pressure to bear there too.

So far as sweepstakes are concerned, excess may be of two kinds, both harmful. The first kind lies in the amount of thought, time, and money which individuals may give to a game which is at once one of avarice and of chance. That is a danger more fitly guarded against by education than by law; and by education we include, of course, religious education. We doubt, in fact, whether anything but religion is strong enough to discipline the gambling instinct, and train it into the one channel where it is fruitful—the staking of life upon religion being true. It is often said that social conditions have much to do with the growth of betting; but we question this. At any rate, in New Zealand, where social conditions are perhaps

as favourable as anywhere in the world, betting is almost universal, and has increased greatly in recent years. The best prophylactic would seem to be a religion so full of appeal to the imagination and the will as to make the lower forms of excitement seem dull.

The second kind of danger is far less widely realized, but from the civic point of view no less important. It lies in the gigantic size of the prizes. That a person who has never been accustomed to handle more than a few pounds, and never been educated to do so, should suddenly become possessed of £30,000 is a patently anti-social occurrence. It advertises before the eyes of the unthinking a wholly false example of the way in which wealth is properly acquired; it indoctrinates the public with the notion that money is a matter of purely individual gain instead of one of trusteeship; and it involves great economic waste through the passing of large sums into purely fortuitous pockets. No State can acquiesce in the spread of such a system without abdicating one of its principal functions—that of maintaining a high standard of political economy amongst its citizens.

The case seems obviously one that could and should be dealt with by legislation; and we suggest that the methods which have been so successful in promoting temperance in drink afford the best precedent. The question is, in fact, here too one of temperance; and even those who are opposed to all betting on principle may be prepared to agree that, where prohibition (as in this case) would go far beyond the general moral sense of the public, sumptuary legislation of a less drastic kind should be given a fair trial. We suggest that the imposition of a legal limit on the size of the prizes would rapidly tend to bring the whole movement under the control of reason.

To sum up, then:

1. We cannot share the view that sweepstakes are in principle wrong; and in any case it is impossible today to impose that view, by means of total prohibition, on the whole population.
2. The effects of sweepstakes as organized today are none the less seriously anti-social, and the State should intervene by legislation.
3. Such legislation should impose a limit on the size of prizes which may be won, and we suggest a limit of £500. Steps should also be taken to bring the movement within the compass of the Entertainments Tax.

4. Sweepstakes for hospitals or other charitable agencies should be restricted by law, so that only those who are already regular subscribers may participate in them.

2. THE POPE AND SOCIALISM

The frequency with which Papal encyclicals have been appearing in recent months suggests that they represent a policy somewhat analogous to that which led the Church of England to the successive Reports of the Archbishops' Commissions at the end of the war. The general tenour of these encyclicals bears out the already widespread impression that the present Pope, despite his great scholarly attainments, is definitely reverting to the reactionary policies of Pius IX. in the last century. They are not, however, the less interesting for that, and the last of the series, entitled *Quadragesima Annis*, is no exception to the rule. If it did not merit the flaring headlines given it in one newspaper, "The Pope's vigorous onslaught on Socialism," it was none the less a direct challenge to an important political movement of our time. As such, it was well-timed, for there is undoubtedly all over Europe a growing weariness of Socialism and an eager desire to be shown some way out of it.

Yet what is this Socialism of which the Pope spoke? He was careful not to define it. Yet by calling it "the child of Liberalism" he would seem to indicate that what he has in mind is the growing tendency towards belief in the all-sufficiency of the State. In that sense, and perhaps in no other, it would seem fair to say that Socialism represents a stage further than Liberalism on the road of the organization of life by the State. The Pope admits that there are certain aspects of Socialism which are compatible with Christianity: but in general he asserts that no true Socialist can be a good Catholic. Such a judgment is certainly sweeping enough to cause a good many people to think, and that will undoubtedly do good.

Much that the encyclical says as to the Church's teaching in regard to the right relations between Capital and Labour has figured prominently in English Christian Socialism from the time of Maurice and Kingsley to the present day. But when the Pope goes on to ascribe the improvement in the social conditions of the working-classes during that period to Roman Catholic teaching, and particularly to the encyclical of Leo XIII., he is obviously somewhat wide of the mark. In England, at any rate, the improvement has resulted chiefly from the operation

of that liberal spirit, both in ecclesiastical and in political quarters, which he congratulates his predecessor on having condemned. The work of the Friendly Societies and of some at least of the Trades Unions, supported as it has been by men of the type of Scott Holland and Canon Barnett, not to speak of earnest social reformers in all the Parliamentary parties, has been the chief cause of the improvement that has taken place. And honour is no less due to these reforming agencies because modern political democracy has largely wrested the movement out of their hands and is guiding it into dangerous courses.

So far as our own country is concerned, the great charge that lies against Socialism is that it has reduced the majority of English citizens to the condition of a mere proletariat. By concentrating the whole burden of taxation on to a mere fraction of the population, the Socialist movement has infected the remainder with one of the most dangerous poisons that can threaten the life of a State. Democracy can only be healthy if every citizen feels responsibility for the welfare of the whole; and such responsibility can only be felt by those who bear their share of the financial burdens involved. It is true that the present scale of working-class rents and rates involves heavy burdens of a financial kind, but they are themselves largely due to the supersession of the private builder by the State and municipal bodies, and the burdens involved cannot be, and are not, regarded as contributions to the welfare of the State. We have got, therefore, a vicious circle; the disease feeds on itself, and the electorate demands larger and larger doses of its dope. The result is the introduction of a frankly predatory taxation, of which the projected Land Tax is the most flagrant example. The questions, "How shall the State's liabilities be most efficiently and economically discharged?" and "How shall these liabilities be most equitably placed on the shoulders of the citizens?" have given place to the single question, "Which group of citizens shall we most easily rob?"

Those who are acquainted with the history of ancient Greece and Rome, or remember those great chapters in the *Republic* where Plato traces the degeneracy of cities in which the proletariat—the "drones," as he calls them—secures the upper hand, will be alive to the crisis through which we are passing. Little can be expected of a Parliament which conceives its functions to lie in deciding the number of people who may be allowed to travel to the poll in a motor-car: Nero fiddling while Rome was burning presented a more interesting spectacle. But much may be expected of the Church, and that in three

ways. In the first place, its doctrine of Justice, which is the cardinal doctrine of its political philosophy, corresponds to something deep-seated in the human conscience, and its inculcation at the present time may do much to arouse even a public opinion as lethargic as our own. In the second place, Church-people are trained in a habit of giving, which is the very reverse of the claim to rights without duties now so widespread in the electorate. The Pauline principle that the Church's members should share its burdens in proportion to their ability to do so can be brought home to the State not only by precept but by example; and in setting that example they will show themselves very plainly to be "the salt of the earth." Finally—and this point was powerfully made in a leading article in the *Church Times* of May 29 last—the Church has a duty to the poor, and a knowledge of their lives, which must move her to vigorous protest against modern bureaucratic Socialism. Thirty years ago the pioneers of the Labour movement in politics—men like Mr. Burt and Mr. Keir Hardie—were closely in touch with the poor and cared for them intensely. How far can that be said of the Labour movement today? Competing with Mr. Lloyd George for the votes of an industrial *bourgeoisie* which cares for nothing so much as cheap consumption, they have ceased to think of the human side of unemployment, while the unemployed themselves are plunged deeper and deeper into fatalism and bought off with a dole which has become already an electioneering counter. The inculcation of fatalism is one of the oldest methods by which power has been gained and exercised over the poor. But it is the very antithesis of Christian faith, and it involves a bankruptcy of political thought and *morale* which the Church must openly challenge.

3. THE ITALIAN TROUBLES

No one can read without anxiety of the grave issues which have arisen in connection with the *Azione Cattolica* in Italy; and the Government's suppression of all organizations of youth which are not dependent on the Fascist movement or the Balilla is one of the most ominous events of modern times. At the time when the Concordat and the Lateran Treaty were signed, we expressed serious doubts as to whether the Pope had not blundered, and everything that has happened since has confirmed our doubts. The truth is that he is claiming two incompatible things—religious liberty and the temporal power. We cannot but be shocked when we read of the Vatican guards being served out with rifles and ammunition instead of their customary halberds, and of the Pope advising the

Young Catholic clubs to resist by force the attacks upon their property. To such a successor of St. Peter Christ would surely have said, "Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of man." At the same time the issue created by the Government's suppression of these clubs is one of first-rate importance for religious liberty. As Lord Acton pointed out in his classical essay on "The Protestant Theory of Persecution,"* religious liberty includes the liberty of the religious community no less than of the individual, and it is this that is chiefly in danger from the modern theory of State absolutism.

For religious liberty (he says) is not the negative right of being without any particular religion, just as self-government is not anarchy. It is the right of religious communities to the practice of their own duties, the enjoyment of their own constitution, and the protection of the law, which equally secures to all the possession of their own independence.

That is the right which the Italian Government would seem to be directly challenging. The Pope would be in a far better position to take up the challenge if he was not cumbered with the claim to temporal power.

4. REUNION WITH THE EAST

The Bishop of Gloucester made an admirably effective reply to the manifesto issued in May by a group of Evangelicals and Modernists, and we do not suppose that the Bishops will be deterred from going forward in the discussions with the Eastern Orthodox projected by the Lambeth Conference. There is something diverting in the XXXIX. Articles being trumped up to obstruct these discussions by those who in domestic Church affairs are accustomed to regard them with scant respect. What is more serious is the evidence of narrow insularity in regard to the affairs of the Church which the manifesto afforded; and if indeed this was all that the Church of England could offer, it could not any longer expect to enlist the faith of intelligent men. Happily the sense of Catholic Churchmanship, and the responsibilities which that involves, are now so widely diffused in the English Church that it is possible for us to hold out the right hand of fellowship to Churches whose history and traditions have been very different from our own. And it is the right hand of fellowship which is asked for, resting, as it only can rest, on fundamental agreement in creed and worship. They and we alike will gain immensely by overcoming our several isolations, and both will be in a stronger position both for witnessing in the world and for rebutting Roman propaganda.

* *History of Freedom*, pp. 151 ff.

THE PROBLEM OF THE CHURCH IN MODERN RUSSIAN THEOLOGY*

Of the different epochs in the theology of the Eastern Church, the most glorious and significant is certainly the time of the oecumenical councils. The chief problem which confronted Christian thought during these four centuries, from the fourth till the eighth, was christological, and allied to this was the Trinitarian question. The efforts of Greek theology were blessed by God, and the doctrine about Christ as the God-man in one person (*ὑποστάσις*) uniting both natures, human and divine (*ἀσυνχύτως* and *ἀχωρίστως*), was defined as obligatory for every Christian—a fundamental dogma of the Christian faith. The energy of dogmatic thought was not exhausted after these heroic efforts, but it ceased to have such an important objective. It was influenced, not by the interior needs of the dogmatic development of Christian faith, but by the external necessity of polemics in the fight against aggressive Roman Catholicism. It was a time when the schism of the Church was taking place. In this sorrowful epoch Eastern theology lost in some degree its independence and came to be determined by the questions at issue in the controversy between the Eastern and Western Churches. From the time of the Patriarch Photius till the Council of Florence, the problem of the Church existed only as a question dealing with the pretensions of papal supremacy. It is a very remarkable feature of the history of Christian dogmatics that the teaching concerning the nature of the Church itself really arose during the Reformation, and at first among different branches of the reformed Church which needed a justification of their separation from the universal Roman Catholic Church. It was necessary for the reformers to show that true Church life could exist outside of the Roman Catholic Church. They proceeded from the exterior, visible organization to the interior, invisible life of the soul; and the life of the personality, not of the whole Church, became the centre of attention. Instead of Roman imperialistic universalism there arose Protestant individualism. The Church was understood to be an aggregate of separate souls with their spiritual destinies, a *universale post rem*, but not *ante rem*. Personal faith, the remission of personal sins, the assurance of personal salvation—these individual destinies really exhausted for them content of the Church, which became an invisible fact in the individual

* An address given to London theological students at King's College, London, January 14, 1931.

soul and in a multitude of different souls. The visible Church only retained significance as an outward institution, one society among others, specialized rather in its purpose than in its mystical being. One of the important results of such an individualistic idea of the Church was the so-called secularization of the whole of life. The Church limited itself to the domain of individual life and abandoned the world to its own laws. Protestantism saved the intimacy and freedom of personal religious life from the despotism and superstitions of mediæval Catholicism at the very high price of the destruction of the Church conceived of as a whole.

The development of the Roman Catholic Church after the Reformation was largely determined by reaction from the Reformation, or by counter-Reformation. From Trent to the Vatican Council, the idea of the Church became more external than ever. Questions of organization, especially that of papal power, became central in Roman ecclesiology. It is a characteristic fact that at the Vatican Council the general question "on the Church" was answered by a single definition: the Pope's supreme power and infallibility. Belonging to the Church meant primarily obedience to the Pope. Therefore in the Western mind there are now two quite opposite conceptions of the Church: Protestant individualism and papal absolutism. But these doctrines being contradictory are both cast in the same mould. Both understand as the first essential an empirical organization; both regard the Church as a community (society, *societas perfecta*) which has its own type of organization. The life of the Church is a result of correct organization. Such a conception is one-sided from an Eastern point of view. Of course, the Church is a society, and as such it is an organization dependent on the right correlation of hierarchy and flock. That was instituted by our Saviour Himself and has been conserved through the ages, as a living tradition of the Church, in the apostolic succession of sacramental power in the hierarchy. The question arises: Does the right organization of the Church alone express its real fundamental essence? Does it belong to noumenon of the Church or only to phenomenon? Is the Church an organization only, or much more, a mystical body? And what is this body in essence? That is the chief question of modern Russian ecclesiology. During the Reformation and afterwards until the nineteenth century the Eastern Church took no active part in the battle over the problem of the Church. It remained on the defensive equally against papal aggressive proselytism and against the destructive influence of individualistic anti-hierarchical Protestantism with its different heresies. Eastern theology during

the Reformation and after was doctrinally determined more by motives of polemic and defence, but in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries Russian thought has been seeking its own ideas, independent of the Western mind. In regard to the doctrine of the Church as a society established by God, Russian theology reaffirms its fidelity to the ancient holy Catholic tradition. In the first place, the Church is a society united by the general teaching derived from Holy Scripture, by dogmatic definitions of the universal Church, and by a living liturgical tradition and practice. Secondly, it retains particularly the seven sacraments and many other sacramental actions, together with the liturgical canon (or typicon). Thirdly, it conserves the hierarchy of apostolic succession by which the external organization is determined. These three pillars—teaching, sacraments, hierarchy—are the apostolic basis of the Church. To doubts and questions about the invisible Church, or about the visible organ of the highest power in it, Orthodox theology gave at first a simple negative answer. Rejecting the Protestant teaching about the invisible Church without a visible sacramental hierarchy, it reaffirmed the idea of the Church as a hierarchical visible society, containing an invisible spiritual life: refuting the Roman Catholic idea of the papal supremacy as a real basis of the Church, it emphasized the significance of Church Councils. Recent Russian theology has taken a further step. It has tried not merely to acknowledge the historical fact of this organization of the Church, but also to explain it as a dogmatic idea. This has been achieved through the conception of *sobornost*, suggested first by the Russian theologian Chomiakoff—i.e., the idea of the nature of the Church as a mystical organism in which many live in the unity of charity. In that union the individual personality is not lost, but is related to others in humility and love, and this mystical unity is the supreme reality of Church life. In this unity all believers, and not the hierarchy alone, conserve and witness to the truth, affirm and receive new definitions or institutions, and refute false ones. The councils are only the external form of this interior unity of spirit. They are not the superior power in the Church, like a collective pope, but the solemn means of the expression of this unity. The councils are received (or rejected) by the people, and in this sense they are unlike papal infallibility, which acts *ex sese non ex consensu ecclesiae*.

Russian theology does not ask, Who constitutes the Church? but, What is the Church? The Church exists not merely in this world as visible, but also in heaven. In this sense it is an object of faith, as is indicated in the Nicene Creed: "I believe in one Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church." In this metaphysical,

ontological sense it is the invisible Church, becoming visible in the symbols and institutions of the visible world. The Church as a spiritual being is invisible, but is revealed and is to be felt and seen in the body. We find in Holy Scripture different expressions for this divine, eternal aspect of the Church. The most important texts in this connection are those in which the Church is the principal ground of all creation and its inner law and goal. In Proverbs viii-ix we find general teaching about the Wisdom which God had "in the beginning" of the creation, and which was an object of joy to Him. (The same teaching is developed in Hellenistic language in the deuterocanonical book the Wisdom of Solomon, and in later Hebrew style in the Wisdom of J. Sirach.) Wisdom is used here, not in the sense of a quality or capacity, but as an objective divine principle or being, godlike, but differing from the personality of God. In the history of exegesis it has been very often identified with the Logos, not only by Arius, but by his Orthodox opponents, St. Athanasius, St. Basil, and other fathers of the Church. Nevertheless, the liturgical use of these texts in the Orthodox Church on the feast-days of the Blessed Virgin is decidedly unfavourable to such an identification. This principle of God's Wisdom is the same in heaven as on earth, in the divine, uncreated, as in the created worlds. Thus there is a distinction between the uncreated and created *Sophia*, as two different modes of the one principle; in eternal plenitude and perfection, and in temporal development and progress. This identity of the divine plenitude in eternity and of its temporal development (*γένεσις*) in the world is definitely found as the theme of the Epistle to the Ephesians with its teaching about the *πλήρωμα θεοῦ*. This "fulness of God that filleth all in all" (i. 23) is at first the divine and immutable principle of the whole, as it is the principle of human development in the Church: "that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." This idea of the Church as God's Wisdom and Fulness had a cosmic aspect: "God possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was . . . and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him . . . and my delights were with the sons of men" (Prov. viii. 22, 30). In the Shepherd of Hermas we find a similar sentence: that God created the world for the Church, which was the chief reason for its creation. And in Dionysius pseudo-Areopagite and in John of Damascus we find teaching about the prototypes (*προορισμοί*) of all existing things, the whole world being their image, and the prototypes themselves being an image of God in God Himself. This is the Holy *Sophia* as an uncreated principle of the created world.

In this sense the Wisdom of God could be called the soul of the world, its inward principle; and there is an identity between the heavenly Wisdom and the creation which is realized during the cosmic and historical process and is ended by the complete fusion of the two, when God will be all in all.

But this revelation of God in the world and His glorification in creation has its origin in the self-revelation of God in Himself, which takes place in the womb of the Holy Trinity. The Father, who is incomprehensible mystery and silence, a transcendent principle (*ἀρχή*) of Deity (*ἀυτόθεος*), reveals Himself in His Word, which is born of Him. The Father speaks His own Word, which is the whole divine idea, and the same Father pours His Holy Spirit of love on this ideal Word. This Spirit gives reality to the ideal Word in beauty. Thus the Father is revealed through this unity of both, in the Son and the Holy Spirit. Both reveal the same divine life, the first one ideally in thought, and the other really in beauty; both of them in their unity reveal the Father, and the content or object of this revelation is the same for both. This self-revelation of the whole Holy Trinity, or of the Father in the Son through the Holy Spirit, being considered in its content, is God's Wisdom, divinity in God, the divine world before the creation. It is an image of God in Himself, His glory, and man is created according to this image. The image of God as revealed in men is the Church's basis in creation. God said: "Let us make man in Our image, after Our likeness" (Gen. i. 26); and "God created man in His (own) image, in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them" (i. 27). By this God put in man the seed of the Church at the creation, and this seed has to grow in the world. By creating man as male and female and blessing them for multiplying, God gave to man the image of the Holy Trinity, as the unity of the many in love and in one life. In uniting man and wife in one being, God inscribed in the life of man the mystery of Christ and the Church, which, according to the Epistle to the Ephesians, has its figure in marriage. In Adam and Eve there pre-existed already the New Adam—Jesus Christ—and the New Eve—the Holy Virgin; in the body of Adam God provided the future body of Christ and in the body of Eve the future body of the Mother of God. In the Church man loves the image of God in Himself and, loving it, loves himself by godly love. By love man becomes a member of the Church, enters into it. This Church love is wonderfully figured in the most beautiful song which has ever been sung by human lips, the Song of Songs. According to its symbolism, Christ is represented as a bridegroom and the Church as a bride.

The Church is an *eternal humanity* revealed in created

humanity. This is an anthropological aspect of the Wisdom of God, which has "delight in the sons of men." The divine original of created humanity is the eternal Church, the heavenly Jerusalem, in which we have "a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (2 Cor. v. 1). Though eternal in God, the Church exists in creation as founded on the earth in time; beginning in time, it is developed to its fulness till it is prepared for the marriage of Christ with His bride. In human life the Church becomes an institution, which receives its own corresponding law of existence; but it is never limited by the exterior, empirical fact of its existence.

SERGIUS BULGAKOV.

(*To be continued.*)

THE SON OF MAN COMING IN THE CLOUDS

Mark xiii. 26; Matthew xxiv. 30; Luke xxi. 27.

THE picture drawn in these chapters is perplexing, not to say terrifying. Taken by itself it is hardly a true picture of the Christian hope. And when we try to fit it into the other pictures presented to us in the Gospels—pictures of the Incarnation, the Ministry, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection—we find that this picture of the Second Coming does not match at all well.

If we are to understand the meaning of this section in the Gospels we must recognize that here we are dealing with the Messianic Expectation as it was first represented in some of the apocalyptic literature of the period and afterwards accepted by the imagination of the common people. The Messianic Hope fills a large place in the records of the New Testament, and we must often use it as the key to interpret obscure passages. The parables, for instance, have, for the most part, a Messianic background.

The Messianic Hope is made up of three separate strands. Sometimes these are taken singly—sometimes two are bound together—sometimes an attempt is made to plait the three into one rope. But, as we shall see, there are two strands which cannot easily be twisted into each other.

The first and earliest form of the Messianic Hope is the expectation of a King, descended from David, conquering all the enemies of his people, and finally bringing to them the gifts of righteousness and peace. This is the consolation offered by Isaiah to the people of Jerusalem after the terrible invasions and sieges of the armies of Assyria (Isa. ix. 2-7 and xi. 1-9). Micah prophesied comfort in similar language (Mic. v. 2-6). The Deuteronomic reformers a century later entertained the same hope (2 Sam. vii. 12-16). This hope was born of the

dark days of foreign oppression and was revived during the dark days of exile in Babylon. The belief was political, military, and national. At bottom it was the hope of a complete reversal of the course of history. The Hebrews had been conquered and despoiled by the great empires in the past, but in the future, as they hoped, they would become the great empire, conquering and despoiling their enemies.

The hope of a mighty warrior-king who would establish the throne of David was embraced with peculiar fervour amongst the second generation of exiles in Babylon. The Unknown Prophet (Isa. xlv.-lv.) seems to have discovered in Zerubbabel the very man to enact the part of Messianic King (Isa. lv. 3-4). He was descended from David, and willing to lead back to Jerusalem those who would follow him in this splendid venture. His arrival at Jerusalem was hailed by both Haggai and Zechariah as the coming of the Promised Deliverer. He governed in Jerusalem for a while, but only for a short while, for he was soon deposed and his name disappeared from history. But though the fate of Zerubbabel is not related, the effect of his disastrous reign is seen in a century of disillusionment. The hope of a Messiah is not mentioned again for several generations. When the hope of a King is at last renewed, the picture drawn is very different from the earlier picture. The prophet whose name is lost, but whose writing is preserved in the second part of the Book of Zechariah (chaps. ix.-xiv.), presents, not a proud and victorious monarch, but one who comes meekly and peaceably to save the quiet of the land. It is of the utmost importance to notice that this, and not the earlier expectation, is accepted by our Lord as the true forecast of the Messiah's coming.

During the century which followed the failure of Zerubbabel, the Messianic Hope took a different form. This time the hope attached to the Kingdom instead of to the King. The conception of the Messianic Age given in the latest prophecy preserved in the Book of Isaiah (lv.-lxvi.) and in the Book of Malachi (both about 450 B.C.) is the conception of a Kingdom in which God alone is King. There is to be no second frustration through the folly of a human king. Men are taught to look for the Kingdom of God and not for a king descended from David.

This second strand in the Messianic Hope continued into the late literature, and it was in this form that the hope was entertained by the rabbis and officials in the time of our Lord. The literature which belongs to the century before and to the century after the birth of our Lord (usually called apocalyptic) is mainly occupied with the Messianic Kingdom. The Messianic King is mentioned but rarely.

Yet the Messianic King has a place in some of the apocalyptic

writings. It is central in the Similitudes of Enoch and in the Psalms of Solomon. And it is to such apocalyptic writings as these that we owe the third form of the Messianic Hope—the expectation of the Son of Man descending in the clouds from heaven. The earliest mention of this idea is in the Book of Daniel. Just as the earlier hope of the Messianic Warrior was born and reborn in times of severe trial, so this later ideal of the Son of Man originated in the days of the Maccabean persecution. As described in the Book of Daniel (166 B.C.), the Son of Man stands for the Jewish nation. The Book of Enoch, however, a later apocalyptic writing, depicts the Son of Man as a heavenly or angelic creature, semi-divine and semi-human, not born of human-kind (and therefore not of the seed of David), but, instead, descending out of heaven to deliver the people by supernatural power. The confidence in a deliverance upon the plane of history, characteristic of the earlier view of the Messianic Ruler, has been abandoned altogether. The only hope acceptable to these apocalyptic writers is the hope of a divine intervention which will terminate previous history with the destruction or subjugation of the heathen, and make an entirely new beginning upon earth with the supremacy of the Jews. The old order will be brought to an end and the new age introduced by the heavenly champion, the Son of Man.

According to the apocalyptic belief so fervently held by the Jews, the transition from the previous age to the coming age would be cosmic and catastrophic, leading to a new heaven and a new earth. There will be changes in the sky, the sun darkened, the moon turned to blood, the stars falling, the seas roaring, the mountains trembling, and men's hearts failing them. The dead will be raised: those who persecuted the Jews to judgment, but the righteous Jews to a life of peace and prosperity on the renewed earth. This belief in the manner in which the Kingdom would be introduced is reflected in the apocalyptic sections of the New Testament.

With the expectation of the Messianic Kingdom there was sometimes coupled a hope in the Messiah who would bring that Kingdom from heaven to earth. The old idea of the Davidic warrior-king lingered on, and was given a new popularity in the time of our Lord by the Zealots, whose policy was political and military. The conception of the heavenly Son of Man, however, suited much better the ideas of the Messianic Kingdom. But it was difficult to accept both interpretations of Messiahship. The King descended from the stock of David could not easily be identified with the Son of Man descending straight out of heaven. It is interesting to notice that in the seventh chapter of the Gospel according to St. John

both beliefs are mentioned. In verse 27 our Lord is rejected because His origin is known, whereas "when the Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence He comes." The Christ is to come, not of human descent, but on the clouds from heaven. In verse 47 our Lord is rejected because Messiah was to be descended from David and born in Bethlehem, David's village.

Now that we have before our minds the three types of the Messianic Hope, we are in a position to consider our Lord's method in using and interpreting these ideas.

The conception of the Kingdom as held by the Jews of our Lord's own time was national and material. Gentiles might become Jews, but only by ceasing to be Gentiles and becoming Jews would they share in the benefits of the Kingdom. The Messianic Kingdom was for Jews alone. This limitation of the ideal is rejected by our Lord. Many of His parables seek to correct this nationalistic prejudice. And further, the nature of the Kingdom is not material and political. It does not mean prosperity or empire. The Kingdom of Heaven is within, and it is spiritual—it comes by a surrender to the will of God, who is at once both righteous King and loving Father (Luke xvii. 20 and 21).

In keeping with this loftier teaching on the nature of the Kingdom is the new conception of the Messiah. Our Lord never claims to be the Davidic King. That part is entirely out of harmony with His teaching about the Kingdom of God. The only Kingship that he could recognize as true for Messiah was the ideal of the humble monarch given in the second part of the Book of Zechariah. Christ's Kingdom was not of this world (John xviii. 36).

Instead of the title Son of David, our Lord uses the other title for Messiah, the Son of Man. The phrase in Aramaic may mean no more than our phrase, "every son of his mother." Sometimes in the Gospels it is used simply for man, any man, every man (Mark ii. 10 and 28; Matt. xii. 32, viii. 20, and ii. 19, with parallels in the other Gospels).

But the phrase might be used with a Messianic significance, and this would be evident from the context (*e.g.*, Mark viii. 38, xiii. 26, xiv. 62; Matt. xxiv. 30, xxvi. 64).

A critical study of the Gospels shows that our Lord only used the title towards the end of His ministry on earth. He made no claim to Messiahship prior to the incident at Cæsarea Philippi. And then, and on subsequent occasions, He made it clear to His disciples that He was giving to the conception an entirely new significance. This was not acceptable to His disciples. "That be far from Thee, Lord," said St. Peter, meaning that such was not the Messiahship that he and the others

claimed for their Lord. The new interpretation came from a passage in the Scriptures (Isa. liii.) which had never by anyone else been regarded as Messianic. Indeed, this conception of salvation by suffering and death was a flat contradiction to what was believed to be Messiah's mission. Even after the Crucifixion, in which the prophecy of the suffering servant found its supreme fulfilment, the disciples were still at a loss to understand what had befallen. They had been taught a new meaning, but it was a hard saying, and they had not been able to learn.

And since, unquestionably, the disciples misunderstood our Lord's teaching upon His coming Passion, it is at least possible that they also misunderstood His teaching on another entirely new interpretation of Messiahship. Our Lord claimed to be the Son of Man. But is it not probable that the conception of the Son of Man coming on the clouds would be both modified and also enriched, so that it would be in line with the new teaching on the Messianic Age and on the suffering Messiah? The other two forms of the Messianic belief were both purified and ennobled. The picture of the Kingdom and the portrait of the King are distinctively Christian, original and unique. But the picture of the Son of Man and of His coming in the clouds is entirely Jewish, wholly of a piece with contemporary apocalyptic, uninfluenced by specifically Christian beliefs, and moreover, inconsistent with the new teaching on the nature of the Kingdom and the purpose of the King. Of the two alternatives which confront us, it is more likely that the disciples misunderstood the teaching of our Lord when He spoke of His coming again in the clouds as the Son of Man, than that our Lord failed altogether to interpret this belief in accordance with His new teaching on Messiahship. (Matt. x. 23 is evidence of misunderstanding.)

It cannot be doubted that our Lord claimed to be the Son of Man, and further it cannot be doubted that our Lord taught his disciples that, as the Son of Man, He could come again from heaven with glory, and come to reign as the true Messiah in the Kingdom of God. It is highly probable that our Lord regarded His death as the appointed means by which He would be enabled to come again as the Messianic Deliverer, not of the Jews only, but of all mankind. All this may be true, and yet the apocalyptic picture of a physical descent upon a material cloud is not the only way in which Messiah may truly come to reign amongst men. On the manner of His coming again the disciples may well have misunderstood our Lord. That would not be surprising, nor would it be an irremediable error. The Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, would lead them out of error and misconception into all truth.

And what we find in the early history of the Christian Church is just such a leading of believers into a truer conception of the manner and purpose of our Lord's coming again. At first and for many years the newly formed Church looked for a speedy return of the Lord from heaven. The letters of St. Paul to the Thessalonians are sufficient evidence of this belief. The same belief is found again in the letter to the Corinthians, in the chapter usually read at the Burial Service. More than this, the first three Gospels all contain a considerable amount of apocalyptic forecast. St. Luke, however, has much less than his predecessors. And between the writing of his Gospel and the writing of the Acts, a change in the belief of the early Church is clearly discernible. Indeed, the change is so conspicuous that it cannot be overlooked by any serious student of the New Testament.

In the Gospel St. Luke barely mentions the Ascension. Immediately after giving the commandment to His disciples to tarry until they received "power from on high," our Lord "was carried up into heaven." The manner of His ascent is not described. The apocalyptical colouring is noticeably absent. In the Acts, however, the cloud is mentioned. And whereas the Gospel had said nothing of a coming again, but only of the "promise of the Father," the Acts speaks of a coming again "in like manner," which must refer to the cloud. At first sight this may seem to be a return to the traditional belief. In truth, however, in the Acts, St. Luke advances beyond the Gospel. The description of the Ascension is preceded by a Messianic question, "Dost Thou (the Messianic Son of Man) restore the Kingdom to Israel?" In other words, Is the time at hand for the Son of Man to come in the clouds and usher in the new age for the benefit of the Jews? And notice the answer. No word about the coming again of the Son of Man to fulfil this purpose. But a coming is mentioned—"When the Holy Ghost is come upon you." And what follows—a Kingdom restored to Israel? No, but instead, a Kingdom preached "unto the uttermost part of the earth." Here, then, is the key provided for the interpretation of the coming again in the clouds. Having found the key, St. Luke no longer feels constrained to ignore the popular belief as he had done in concluding his Gospel. And what follows in the Acts, in the description of Pentecost (identified by the quotation from Joel with the Messianic and apocalyptic "Day of the Lord"), and in the subsequent and frequent outpourings of the Spirit, is related as the story of the increasing return of the King in the extension of the Kingdom.

More significant even than the advance in St. Luke's teaching is the changed point of view in the later letters of St. Paul. So marked is this change that Dr. Moffatt is unable to accept "Ephesians" as the work of St. Paul. In the latest commentary, however, by so eminent a scholar as Professor E. F. Scott, the Pauline authorship is defended. In this epistle, as in the Acts, the coming of Christ is closely related to the gift of the Spirit (iii. 16 and 17).

When we turn to the Fourth Gospel, which was written much later than the other Gospels, we find that the promise of a second coming is reinterpreted to mean the coming of the Spirit. This is made evident, especially in the sixteenth chapter. In verse 7 it is said that only if Christ goes can the Comforter come. In chapter xiv. 26 the Comforter is identified with the Holy Spirit. Hence we must infer that the Holy Spirit could not be given while our Lord was still on earth with men. And this is plainly stated in chapter vii. 39: "The Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified." There can be no explanation why the Holy Spirit could not be given while our Lord was on earth except, because the spirit to be given was none other than the Spirit of the risen and glorified Christ. (Some ancient MSS. read here "the Holy Spirit was not yet given." This is probably correct, the word "Holy" being omitted later on account of theological difficulties.) The same close association between the Holy Spirit and the Spirit of the Risen Lord had been made in Acts xvi. 6 and 7. The phrase in Acts, "the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not," and the phrase in the Fourth Gospel, "the Spirit was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified," have always offered insuperable difficulties to theologians and commentators—and they always must until it is recognized that both St. Luke and St. John intend to interpret the gift of the Spirit from heaven as the fulfilment of the promise that our Lord would come again in the clouds. But to return to the sixteenth chapter of St. John, when the Evangelist has made it clear that the Comforter, the Holy Spirit of Truth, can only come after Christ has ascended and that Christ will certainly send the Comforter (xv. 26 and xvi. 7), then he proceeds to mention the coming again of our Lord Himself, and, moreover, His coming again in a little while (xvi. 17 and xvi. 18). The stress laid upon "a little while" is strange in a Gospel written not less than sixty years after the Ascension. Christ had not come again in the clouds in the first generation, as the later letters of St. Paul bear witness. Yet the promise had been that these things should be fulfilled before the passing of that generation (Matt. xxiv. 34; Mark xiii. 30; Luke xxi. 32; and also very important, Matt.

xvi. 28). The "little while" in St. John is intended to refer back to the generation of the first disciples.

At the time when the Fourth Gospel was written the first generation of believers was almost passed. Few, if any, were still surviving who had heard the words of our Lord foretelling His return. Our Lord had not returned in the clouds during the lifetime of those who stood by when He taught in Galilee and Judea. The Christian Church was, therefore, in a dilemma. Either Christ had not returned, as He had promised, within a generation, or He had returned, as He promised, to those who were His first followers, but His return had been otherwise than upon the clouds. Correction of evident misunderstanding was imperative. It was necessary to reinterpret either His coming in this generation or His coming upon a cloud. The reiteration of "a little while" by a writer so long after the Crucifixion was only possible because of the conscious and deliberate interpretation of the second coming as a spiritual and invisible coming, a coming by the Holy Spirit into the hearts of believers. This is clearly the teaching which is intended in the whole Gospel, and which is emphasized time and again in the central chapters xiv. to xvi. The spiritual interpretation is presented in the story of Nicodemus and confirmed in the story of Thomas, both of whom were at fault in demanding the physical instead of the spiritual reality.

The apocalyptic passages in the first three Gospels need to be understood aright, and they can only be understood aright when they are interpreted in the light of the developing belief of the early Church. St. Paul's later epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Fourth Gospel give unmistakable indications of the direction in which the Holy Spirit was leading the Church during the century after the Crucifixion.

In making use of apocalyptic language our Lord was taking the thought-forms of the time and place and using them as symbols for His own higher truth. That the new meaning should have been misunderstood at first is not surprising. But the apocalyptic manner of describing the Kingdom had an essential truth of its own. The Kingdom is the gift of God to men (Luke xii. 32). The Kingdom proclaimed by Jesus is not rightly conceived as a human achievement, the final result of social reform and humanitarian advance. The Kingdom is God's creation, not man's. Man does not make the Kingdom: it awaits him; he enters into it, and rejoices in the glorious liberty conferred upon him as a citizen of the heavenly city.

And as the Kingdom which is within us comes, not with observation—so likewise does the King come to reign in our hearts. "Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

CYRIL H. VALENTINE.

THE ANGLICAN'S OBLIGATIONS

ONE of the speakers at the Anglo-Catholic Congress of 1930 quoted a significant remark made to him by an enquirer, who said, "I belong to the ordinary Church of England. I am not an Anglo-Catholic, and it is different with us: *we have not any obligations.*"

That expresses a very common belief. Every priest encounters it. And a determined attempt is now being made to remedy the state of things implied by such a remark. The Precepts of the Church are being more systematically taught than has hitherto been the case, and every effort is being made to base the observances of the Christian life on the foundation of obligation and duty rather than on that of interest and self-pleasing.

Some preliminary considerations suggest themselves. It is urged that the danger of Pharisaism would overtake a movement which interpreted religion in the sense of adherence to a set of rules. That is probably a risk. But risks have to be taken, and on the opposite side there is the risk that, as Newman pointed out, "those persons who attempt to worship in a more spiritual manner end, in fact, by not worshipping at all." That this is so, experience bears witness. That penetrating observer, the late Charles Marson, asked, "What hold has Anglicanism on the ordinary Anglican? None at all. A Roman Catholic will spend ten years in the Australian Bush and be faithful to his religion and return to it at the first opportunity, but his English brother cannot be trusted for ten minutes near a strange conventicle." And Charles Booth noted, in his monumental *Life and Labour in London*, that "the poor (except the R.C. poor) do not attend service on Sunday morning."

The strange idea that the English Churchman has no obligations would scarcely occur to anyone familiar with the Canons. These rules were not merely regulations for the clergy, but affected the laity closely. The Canons of 1603 are believed to have been drawn up by Archbishop Bancroft, and were assented to by both Convocations. Though not ratified by Parliament, they are pronounced by Lord Chancellor Hardwicke to possess great weight as "declaratory of the ancient law and usage of the Church of England."

Passed in difficult times, the Canons of 1603 go as far as the Church of England has ever gone in the direction of accommodating its usages to what was practicable rather than what was desirable, and the very fact that their framers were prepared to excommunicate and denounce heretics (Canons V., etc.)

rendered it incumbent upon them to make the boundaries as wide as they reasonably could, so as not to exclude any who could by any possibility be brought within the National Church. Even the more "advanced" Canons of 1640, which enjoined curtains and candlesticks for the Holy Table and other decencies of worship, did not go beyond a pious wish that "unity of Faith were accompanied by uniformity of practice in the outward worship and service of God."

Yet, despite the moderate standard which was all that was aimed at, the Canons are unmistakably Catholic. Bancroft included among the duties of the minister "the absolving of the penitent, praying for and blessing of the people, administration of the Sacraments and the like." That exhibits the Catholic conception of the priest as opposed to the Puritan notion of the minister. A marked resemblance has been traced between our Canons and those of Cardinal Borromeo of Milan in 1565-74, not only in the subjects treated (*e.g.*, the importance of frequent sermons), but even in the unusual Latin words employed. Matters of detail are the concern of local churches, as stated by Art. XXXIV., which follows the dictum of Lyndwood: "In Divinis officiis quælibet ecclesia servat suam consuetudinem" (Lib. ii., tit. iii.). Hooker quaintly enlarges upon this principle by finding in the vesture of the queen "wrought about with divers colours" ("circumdata varietate") a type of the diversities of outward use in the Church, while its inner unity is symbolized by the seamless robe of Christ. "In veste varietas sit, scissura non sit."

The sword and the trowel are not easy implements to wield together, but the task of the Church of England in the years 1552 to 1662 might justly be described by that metaphor. This was the real Reformation Settlement, succeeding the Reformation Unsettling, and during its course two foes had to be faced, the carping Puritan and the creeping Papist. While Hooker had to defend the Church against Travers, Jewell essayed the same task against Harding, and Andrewes engaged Bellarmine. All the while, a process of building up went steadily on, and the Anglican Church as we know it slowly emerged from the dust of conflict. Many imperfections exist as the scars of that conflict, but the main lineaments stand out as unmistakably Catholic. The following features of Church order enumerated in the Canons clearly belong to the Catholic notion of the Church.

Church Government (Canons 139-41).—"The Sacred Synod" is indicated as the central and binding authority. This is not any "Church Assembly," but the lords spiritual and the Conventions.

The Bishops are the normal rulers of the Church. They grant "faculties" to the clergy (Canon 137) in accordance with Catholic custom, and issue directions (Canon 119) to the Church officers to see that all is in order in the churches under their care. Some of these Visitation Articles—*e.g.*, those of Cosin, in 1661—show that strong efforts were made to secure the decencies of Catholic worship.

Discipline.—In this connexion, the series of Canons relating to Church Courts (Canons 92, 119, etc.) reveal an elaborate system of discipline for laity as well as clergy. These regulations have long been obsolete, and in 1865 it was sought to revise and bring them up to date. But relics of them remain—*e.g.*, it has been pointed out that the singular collocation of "Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty" in our civil courts is due to the fact that cases relating to occurrences at sea were dealt with by the canon law, which was extra-territorial, and similarly, matrimonial causes came under the canon law, not under the civil law of the land. *N.B.*—Canon 105 forbids the remarriage of separated persons.

Confession.—Canon 113 lays it down that those who confess their secret and hidden sins are to be safeguarded. "We do straitly charge and admonish him (the minister) that he do not at any time reveal and make known to any person whatever any crime or offence so committed to his trust and secrecy." Bishop Duppa's Visitation Articles in 1638 enforce this.

Communion.—The ancient rule of the Paschal Precept is enforced in Canon 112, and those who disregard it are to be delated to the Bishop within forty days of Easter. Excommunication is a serious matter, and the excommunicate person is expelled from Church (Canon 59).

Ordering of Services.—Canon 91 requires that the Parish Clerk be qualified not only in reading and writing, but in singing, while Canon 14 avers that the Common Prayer be sung distinctly and reverently, to the "modest and distinct song" or "plain tune" of ancient usage. Clerk and ministers are to be suitably arrayed (Canon 74 quaintly prohibits "coifs and wrought nightcaps" and light coloured stockings!). The clergy are directed by Canon 58 to wear a decent and comely surplice with hood or tippet. Holy days are to be declared to the people, as are fasting days. In cathedrals it is ordered that the celebrant wear a cope, and be assisted by Gospeller and Epistler agreeably [attired] (Canon 24).

Reverence and devotion are urged upon worshippers (Canon 18), and the Communion is to be celebrated at least on the principal feast days (Canon 24), while in College chapels the Sacrament is to be administered on the first or second Sunday

of each month. A table of feasts and vigils is given in the Prayer Book, and its observance enjoined by Canon 14. Sundays are to be kept (Canon 13) in worship and works of mercy, and though the duty of being present at the Eucharist is not enjoined (as indeed it could not well be in those troublous days when the offering of the Holy Sacrifice was sadly infrequent), yet the aim of the Canons is clear enough—viz., to secure a minimum of decent observance.

Fasts as well as feasts are to be kept at the traditional times—*e.g.*, the Ember seasons (Canons 31, 64, and 72). Reverence is to be made at every mention of the Sacred Name (Canon 18). Altars are to be fittingly furnished with a "carpet of silk or other decent stuff" and a white linen cloth (Canon 82), and the Sign of the Cross is elaborately defended (Canon 30). Baptism is not, except by necessity, to be administered anywhere but in church (Canon 69), while Confirmation is to be regarded as essential (Canon 61). Laymen cannot preach (Canon 72), and "strange preachers" (*i.e.*, Puritan teachers) are sternly forbidden.

The foregoing analysis makes it abundantly clear upon which side the Church of England stood in the widening cleavage between Puritan and Catholic. In government, discipline, ordering of services, and orthodoxy of belief, the Anglican Church ranged itself on the Catholic side.

The fact that penal consequences no longer follow breach of rules has led to the unwarrantable inference that the rules no longer exist. That involves the fallacy of supposing that a rule only exists if penalties for its non-observance are enforceable in State courts. There is still the ecclesiastical weapon of excommunication, provided for in the Prayer Book, and a recent painful case recalled the fact that the power still exists, though the machinery for its exercise is necessarily slow in action. The question of penalties scarcely enters into the discussion where a number of persons have excommunicated themselves by abstention from the Sacraments. Disciplinary measures are adopted in the Canons of certain of the missionary provinces, and the whole subject could only be considered in relation to the conclusions at which they had arrived. The task of framing disciplinary rules for Churchpeople in England presents insuperable difficulty, but the contention of this paper is that the principles are there, and have never been abandoned. The Canons, with their outline of the Catholic system, however attenuated, require Sunday worship, observance of feasts and fasts, almsgiving (Canon 84), regular Communion, the Christian rule of marriage, and find a place for confession. Thus the Precepts of the Church, rather in the form in which Bishop

Cosin gives them than in the commonly received order, are enjoined upon English Churchmen. The time has now been reached when these precepts should be steadily commended and faithfully observed. Hitherto, many have observed simply those which commended themselves to their own preference, or have obeyed them under the impulse of some strong persuasion, or from devotion to a particular personality. The Bishop of Whitby, speaking some time ago to the annual conference of C.E.M.S., complained that "a great many Churchpeople are extraordinarily slack about keeping rules. In this lay the great strength of the Church of Rome, which proportionately did get its people, in a wonderful way, to give visible witness that they were prepared to keep the rules of the society to which they belonged."

A healthier condition of spiritual life will result when we do the same.

M. DONOVAN.

LATIN HYMNS OF THE MIDDLE AGES

THE creative genius of Ambrose, as we have already noted in a previous article (September, 1930), gave the Latin Christian hymn a permanent place in the worship of the Church; but, alike in form and matter, further developments were assured as the Church carried her missionary operations into all parts of the Western Empire. During the Dark Ages ecclesiastics famous and obscure, kings, scholars, saints, and confessors were making and singing hymns. Gregory the Great (540-604), greatest of Churchmen by virtue of the concentration of all his powers on the Church, accomplished a reform of Church music not only by establishing a school at Rome for the practice of Church singing, but by his introduction of the *Tones*, which marked a departure from the current free and melodious style of Church music to the austere, simple, and impressive mode with which his name is ever to be associated. When the sack of Rome by Alaric the Goth took place in 410—the portentous event which sent a shock through Christendom and moved Augustine to write on the *Civitas Dei*—the *Te Deum*, which Nicetas of Remesiana had composed, served to steady the faith of sorely troubled scattered groups of Christians among the tribes of the Danube. With that hymn we have already linked the *Veni Creator Spiritus*, written, as is firmly believed by leading hymnologists, in the ninth century by Hrabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mainz (784-856). Hymns to the Holy Spirit are not numerous either in early or medieval Latin liturgies, but after the fateful

millennial year 1000 had come and gone, there appeared the singularly beautiful *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, formerly ascribed to King Robert the Pious, but now held by many to be the work of Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury (d. 1228). It may, however, be the work of Innocent III., according to Raby, since we know that Ulrich, Abbot of St. Gall, spoke to the Pope of Notker, whose work as a sequence writer was then widely known: whereupon the Pope may have introduced his own sequence to the Abbot. It is a difficult question to decide: what is certain is that this lovely lyric deserves its name of the "Golden Sequence."

The monastery of St. Gall was founded in 614 by an Irish monk, Gallus, who gave his name to the town of St. Gall near Lake Constance. In this shrine of classical and sacred learning, according to tradition, Notker the Stammerer (840-912) discovered the sequence. It appears that he had found it difficult to remember the "neumes" or musical notes set to the final *a* of *Alleluia* in the gradual, an anthem which in the Eucharistic office stood between Gospel and Epistle. But a homeless monk who had arrived at St. Gall from Jumièges, where the abbey had been sacked, showed to Notker an Antiphonary where words were set to neumes, but words meaningless and purely mnemonic. Thereupon Notker set himself to compose a sequence with a proper sense and meaning, a sequence being not a metrical hymn, but a prose composition after the manner of *Te Deum*. This story has been doubted, but if Notker is to be deprived of the credit of actual originality, he certainly introduced the sequence to German Christianity. Assigned to him is the famous *Cantemus cuncti melodum* (E.H. 494), but this is probably a composition of a later date. He wrote the sequence on the nativity, *Eia, recolamus laudibus piis digna*, and the *Psallat ecclesia, mater illibata* for the dedication of a church. Possibly, too, the beautiful *Media vita in morte sumus* of the English Burial service is his.

The *Sequentia*, also called *Prosa*, was henceforth to be a permanent feature of liturgical worship in the Western Church, and, further, gave rise to the use of the *Trope* or text which was prefixed or added "to a portion of the Liturgy such as the Introit, the Kyrie, the Gloria, etc." Raby (*Christian Latin Poetry*), from whom we quote, gives as an example the following Trope to the Kyrie found in St. Gall manuscripts of the tenth century:

"Omnipotens genitor lumenque et lucis origo
De nihilo iussu verbi qui cuncta creasti,
Humano generi, peccati pondere presso."

Kyrie eleison.

Subsequently double rhyme was to be found in the sequence, and rhyme and assonance in the eleventh century, as in Gottchalk's sequences, were united. Finally, France produced metrical sequences in the twelfth and thirteenth century, while the Notkerian model of rhythmical prose was retained in Germany. The sequence clearly took on steadily the structure of a hymn, and with Adam of St. Victor attained its crowning excellence.

The monasteries of Cluny and Clairvaux are great names in medieval hymnology, but we should not overlook that of Monte Cassino, the Benedictine foundation, which was a glory of Italy. Under the Abbacy of Desiderius (1058-1087), it was rebuilt and magnificently adorned to become a centre where the art of Christian poetry was exercised. Alphanus, who died in 1085, was an expert hymn writer in the classical metres, but he cannot be compared for spiritual intensity and beauty with Peter Damiani, who died in 1072. A fearless moralist, sick at heart on account of the corruption alike in Church and State, an ascetic who believed that self-renunciation, unsparing and rigid, was the Christian's only hope, Peter Damiani wrote the famous *Gravi me terrore pulsas, vitæ dies ultima*, a hymn of judgment as terrible in its insistence on the punishment of the sinner and its hideous tortures as the *Apocalypse of Peter* in the second century. But over against the haunting gloom of his melodious lines, we can place the famous poem on the beauties of Paradise, the *Ad perennis vitæ fontem meus sitivit arida*, which has been translated by Caswall, Neale, and others, but has not found a place in the ordinary Church hymn books, clearly because of its too exotic lusciousness of style, which in its detail and imagery outdoes the *Apocalypse*. It used to be ascribed to Augustine, and perhaps recalls some of the antitheses of the *Confessions* in such lines as:

"Avidi et semper pleni, quod habent desiderant:
Non satietas fastidit, neque fames cruciat:
Inhiantes semper edunt et edentes inhiant."

(Ever full yet ever longing, what they have they still desire;
No satiety disgusts them, irks them not starvation dire:
They are filled though e'er aspiring and though filled to more aspire.)

But whatever one may feel as regards the medieval treatment of the themes of judgment and bliss, no one can deny the power and verve of these swinging trochaics.

It is natural to place by the side of these hymns, typical of a certain phase of medieval Christian emotionalism begotten of the ascetic life and its protest against a corrupt social order, the famous rhythm of Bernard of Morlaix, a poem of 3,000 lines, *De Contemptu Mundi*. Its metre is remarkable—a six-footed line

of five successive dactyls with no cæsura and a final spondee—composed with leonine and final rhymes. Nothing could be more difficult as a mere *tour de force*, and the author ascribes to the Holy Spirit his triumph over all the difficulties of an amazing composition. Neale chose wisely when he adopted the metre “Brief life is here our portion” and “Jerusalem the Golden” for an English version which is deservedly popular, no reproduction of the original metre being possible or, if possible, tolerable in English. It has a warmth of colouring and tone which places it apart from Peter Damiani’s work—as, for example, in the glowing apostrophe:

“O bona patria, num tua gaudia, teque videbo?
O bona patria, num tua præmia plena tenebo?
Dic mihi, flagito, verbaque reddito, dicque Videbis.”

The other more famous Bernard, *doctor mellifluus* and the author of the *Jubilus rhythmicus de nomine Jesu*, the outstanding spiritual force of his day, the friend of popes and the counsellor of kings, the founder of the Abbey of Clairvaux, preferred to write of the love of God. It was his prose treatise *De diligendo Deo* which formed the basis and inspiration of the *Jesu dulcis memoria* so long held to be his actual composition. Unfortunately “the only hymns of Bernard we possess are of such mediocre quality,” says Raby, “that it is impossible to conceive of him as being the author of these beautiful verses.” But he certainly inspired them: they are the work of a disciple who had imbibed his master’s spirit and felt the evangelical glow of his personality. Similarly the *Oratio rhythmica ad Christum a cruce pendentem* in seven parts, two of which are familiar—*Salve mundi salutare (ad pedes)* and *Salve caput cruentatum (ad caput)*—and have passed into Christian hymn books, can no longer be regarded as Bernard’s work. The whole poem has only appeared in collections of sacred poetry and has been finely translated into German by Paul Gerhardt.

Before speaking of Bernard’s contemporaries we cannot forget what we owe to the French poets of the eleventh century. We have to mention Fulbert of Chartres, a great lover of the humanities, who is represented in the *English Hymnal* by his *Chorus novæ Jerusalem*, in the two versions of J. M. Neale and R. Campbell, a fine Resurrection hymn. With him we have to place Hildebert of Lavardin, a poet worthy of Trench’s high praise, who wrote a hymn on the Three Persons of the Trinity, from which the beautiful *Me receptet Sion illa* comes, a lyric of mystical quality on the Heavenly Sion translated by Crashaw *In Sion, lodge me, Lord, for pity*, and therefore for ever memorable. It is rather remarkable that it is not found in the recent

hymn books which have embodied so much Latin medieval poetry. Nor is Marbod of Rennes, his contemporary and of almost equal poetic talent, represented in our hymn books, though his hymns in leonine verse are notable. Trench quotes his *Deus-Homo, Rex caelorum*, a very simple and beautiful lyric, ending:

“Sicut umbra, sicut fumus,
Sicut fœnum facti sumus
Miserere, Rex caelorum,
Miserere miserorum.”

Reverting to Cluny, where the Benedictine rule was administered by that wise and winsome Abbot, Peter the Venerable, and where Bernard of Morlaix wrote his great satire, we recall the interesting fact that the monastery became a peaceful shelter to the famous Peter Abélard in his latter days. Peter the Venerable himself was a hymn writer—Phillimore quotes his nativity hymn *Cælum gaude, terra plaude* in the *Hundred Best*—but was greater as a man, and it will ever be to his credit that he opened the door to Abélard when, after the Council of Sens, the scholar's spirit was broken and his bodily strength spent, and interceded with the Pope on his behalf. Here Abélard died in 1142. There was a freshness and originality in Abélard's intellect which comes out in the hymns he wrote, hymns remarkable alike in the mastery of metrical forms of his own making and in the matter of his verse. He who “had celebrated his love for Heloise in songs which had been the delight of Paris and were heard in every street” had, at her request, composed hymns “for the whole cycle of the year.” Perhaps the best known is that for the Sabbath (*i.e.*, Saturday vespers), *O quanta qualia sunt illa sabbata*, the only one which appears—it is in Neale's translation—in the *English Hymnal*; but Phillimore has done good service in giving six of his poems, one of which may be quoted for its novel rhyming scheme:

“Advenit veritas,
Umbra præteriit,
Post noctem claritas
Diei subiit,
Ad ortum rutilant
Superni luminis
Legis mysteria
Plena caliginis.”

His thought is characterized by an austere simplicity, almost Ambrosian in spirit; but his method is all his own, without precedent, just as it was destined to have no imitator.

But the glory of the twelfth century is Adam of St. Victor. He brought the Latin sequence to a pitch of finished beauty

and symmetry which had not as yet been attained and was never to be surpassed. Mr. E. H. Blakeney has recently in *Hymns of the Western Church* given us with text and translation a set of twenty-four noble hymns: it would be difficult to improve on his selection, except that some might feel regret for the relegation of the *Jesu dulcis memoria* to an Appendix. Possibly he wished to find room in his limited series for more than one of Adam's hymns. He has given two of his finest, the *Heri mundus exultavit* on St. Stephen, and the *Stola regni laureatus* on the Holy Apostles. The *English Hymnal* gives three: *Jerusalem et Sion filiae* (172), *Supernæ matris gaudia* (200), and *Plausu chorus lætabundo* (179). Of these the first is stated to be ascribed to Adam: for he created a school of poetry. And Mr. Blakeney includes in his twenty-four the *Verbum Dei*, which is the work of a Victorine hymn writer. Adam showed such all-round excellence that no one of his hymns has become a favourite, standing alone as compared with the others; but Raby, along with Trench, instances as characteristic of his technical perfection, his dogmatic and biblical interest, and his love of the symbolism and allegorical aspects of nature the Easter hymn *Zyma vetus Expurgetur*, from which we may quote one stanza:

“ Mors et vita confluxere,
Resurrexit Christus vere,
Et cum Christo surrexere
Multi testes gloriæ.
Mane novum, mane lætum
Vespertinum tergat fletum,
Quia vita vicit letum;
Tempus est lætitiæ.”

But there are other Easter hymns of similar quality, and to point his general excellence it may be noted that Phillimore gives eighteen hymns, not one of which has been mentioned above.

A striking feature of Phillimore's *Hundred Best Latin Hymns* is the large number of hymns—some would say disproportionately large—to the Virgin Mary: but some of these hymns are by writers like Guy de Bazoches and Philippe de Grevia, who are not well known. The former died in 1203, remarkable as belonging to the secular clergy; while the latter, who was Chancellor of the Church of Paris from 1217, spent a large part of his time in the disputes between the University and the Friars. It is impossible to deal with the immense volume of hymns to the Virgin Mary. Undoubtedly it was owing to Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, “the greatest exponents of the spiritual value of virginity,” that the cult of the Virgin in the West originated. The reader is referred to Raby's treatment of the

symbolism of the Virgin Mary (pp. 363-375 of *Christian Latin Poetry*) in order to realize how the medieval mind revelled in the prophecies and poetry, the striking imagery and picturesque stories of the O.T., from which it gathered rich material for the apotheosis of the Virgin. Standing by itself, so far as the writer knows, is Philippe de Grevia's curious dialogue of the Virgin with the Cross given by Phillimore; but nothing in the whole collection equals for poignant beauty and power the *Stabat Mater dolorosa* of Jacopone da Todi: here the Virgin's human maternal love finds its truest expression, and we return to the pure simplicity of the Gospel.

It has not been possible to treat of all the noteworthy Latin hymn writers, including a large number of anonymous composers; but the survey is not complete without a reference to the wonderful Eucharistic hymns of Thomas Aquinas. The four appear in the *English Hymnal*: they are *Lauda Sion Salvatorem*, *Pange lingua gloriosi corporis mysterium*, *Verbum supernum prodiens*, and *Adoro te devote*. Phillimore includes one more—that for the festival of Corpus Christi, *Ad matutinum*—which has the stanza from which Browning may have gathered a hint for his poem *The Bishop orders his Tomb at St. Praxed's Church*:

“Panis angelicus fit panis hominum:
Dat panis cælicus figuris terminum.
O res mirabilis! Manducat Dominum
Servus pauper et humilis.”

It is not surprising that this master intellect, who founded his Christian philosophy on Aristotle and his theology on the authority of the Church, should exercise his poetic powers on the central objective truth of the Sacrament, in which, as he believed, under each kind the whole of Christ was contained. Never has the dogma of transubstantiation received such clear exposition or the Latin hymn expressed so movingly and with such matchless verbal precision the Roman conception of the Mass. These hymns mark the triumph of Roman orthodox thought, but with the Franciscan Movement the emphasis shifted from the objective rite to the personal experience of the presence and power of Christ. Francis, *jongleur de Dieu*, in his love of nature, the coming of the spring, the beauty of all living things, and his sense of fellowship with the elemental powers of the universe, preached a literal imitation of Christ, a life of self-renouncing love combined with contemplation of the Passion and sorrow of the Redeemer. Jacopone da Todi, whose *Stabat Mater* expressed the Franciscan spirit of human compassion and adoration of the Crucified, was a lay-brother who took to a vagrant life after the loss of his beautiful young wife, and wrote

in the Umbrian dialect the *Laude* or poems in praise of the Virgin, Christ, and Paradise: finally he was admitted to the Franciscan order, and attacking the vices of the age and the weakness of the Church was imprisoned by Pope Boniface VIII. Released after eight years, he lived for three years longer, and on his tomb at Todi today we read that *stultus propter Christum nova mundum arte delusit et cælum rapuit*.^{*} Francis' *Hymn to the Sun* was written in Italian—proof of his love of the people, and also of the new tendency to supplant the Latin of the Church by the vernacular, which from this time became more and more the medium in European countries of Christian worship and thought. But one other great Latin lyric by a Brother Minor, Thomas of Celano, the unrivalled *Dies Iræ*, remains to be mentioned. Other hymns on the apocalyptic theme of the Day of the Lord, which to the Christian consciousness is a Day of Judgment, have been cited: it is a recurring theme in medieval poetry, but nothing can equal the effect of the *terza rima* of this poem, its regular beat like the clanging of a funeral bell, its solemnity and awe-inspiring directness of diction. Our conceptions of the last things have undergone modification in the lapse of ages, but the reality of guilt and shame in erring man face to face with the *Rex tremendæ maiestatis* is throughout relieved by the cry for pardon, the sincerity of confession, and the assurance that contrition is not in vain, while prayer intermingles with the thought of a just penalty, and the hymn ends with the words, which for once break through the rhyming sequence:

“Judicandus homo reus:

Huic ergo parce, Deus,

Pie Jesu Domine,

Dona eis requiem.”

The Latin hymn as an exercise was still to be written—e.g., the *Adeste fideles* is included by Phillimore “although no trace of it can be found existing before the year 1736.” But henceforth the hymns of Christian worship were to be composed and sung in the vernacular of the people. The Franciscans marked the transition from the medieval to the modern world.

R. MARTIN POPE.

* Quoted in the recently published *History of Later Latin Literature* by Wright and Sinclair.

CHURCH MUSIC: THE VILLAGE EUCHARIST

I HAVE been spending a short holiday in a quiet Fen village, and attendance at the 10 o'clock Sung Eucharist on two Sundays has given me food for reflection.

An unusually lovely fourteenth-century church is the setting, almost unspoilt. Quite perfect without, with a wealth of flowing tracery in its windows and a noble spire of elegant proportions and reserve, it must be typical of the architectural school which has fired a Cotman, a Bodley, and a Griggs. Within, all is cool and open, lofty and light. Except for a lapse at the east end, the windows retain their square-leaded clear white glass and display their tracery against the fluttering green of the trees outside; the old-world pulpit, sounding-board, and pews are of village craftsmanship, simple and comely, and the chancel is guarded by a good fifteenth-century screen from which, alas, the vault and loft and figures have long since gone. Length and simplicity of line have been restored to the altar, which only falls short of excellence by a superfluity of non-essentials in its furniture and by its being banked too high into the east window. But the great blemish of this lovely building is the solid cubic mass of the organ, which in an astonishing perversity has obtruded itself (within the present century, no less) against the chancel wall, between the altar steps and the screen; and its position is prophetic. The organ dominates the chancel; it is an interloper between the altar and the people.

As organs go, it is not without its parts, but those parts may easily be thrust into the background, and are, by the snarling of a thin-throated horn. The organ dominates the chancel, and the horn dominates the organ.

It is a smallish village, but at least forty children have quietly shuffled into their places, and there is a fair sprinkling of grown-ups. The tapers are lit, and all is ready. A number is announced, and "We love the place, O God" is given out in uncertain time and tones by the interloping instrument. From the improvised vestry under the west tower another eight boys emerge, these in surplices and followed by the celebrant, and before they have reached the middle of the nave they have been coaxed (or bludgeoned) by the ever-present snarling of the horn to add their quota to 'loving the place, O God'. And the horn continues, and the player succeeds in keeping the melody going, though in some desperate attempt not to let the pedals lie idle, all the inner harmony of the tune perishes and there is a maddeningly recurrent inability to achieve even the right bass

note for the last chord of each verse. But the altar has been reached, and the celebrant quietly and audibly begins the service, served by a couple of the surpliced boys. Between the epistle and the gospel a hymn is announced, "Jesu, good above all other." Again the organ fitfully plays through the whole tune over a sketchy harmony, surging up at last through a rich *arpeggio crescendo* to a blurt for the opening of verse one, and gradually a few singers are drawn in. After the gospel is announced there is an ominous pause, a pedal note, an upward surge (left and right hands in due gradation, helped out by swell pedal), a gathering of forces and voices, and nearly all are drawn in by the time the word "Lord" is reached on (or just under) the shrill high note of an entirely irrelevant tune for the response, drawn no doubt from Woodward in E flat.

The priest begins the Creed on a note, the organ suggests another, some of the eight boys in surplices begin singing with the organ, audibly at first and with delightfully broadened Fen vowels; they evidently know the beginning of the Creed by heart, but memory fails as the monotone continues; they race and gabble and forget, all the while putting up a half-hearted running fight against a series of full-handed chords or discords dealt out from the organ. However, all parties manage to steer into port together for "the life of the world to come, Amen." But the forty children and the grown-ups in the nave have stood dispirited and dumb. There is no cohesion; it has been the affair of the eight—and the organ. And what an affair!

It would be easy to continue an analysis of the service. It must suffice to say that from beginning to end, except for a couple of hymns, there is not one shred of music that is not banal in character and slovenly in execution. There is no hymn that escapes a smudged and blurred accompaniment. The priest cannot sing "The Lord be with you" without setting into motion a dreary mechanism of muddle and ugliness—and what for? To grind out a response in which not one voice on the west of the screen joins. On the narrowly liturgical side, everything has been ordered decently and simply, but whenever liturgy touches music (which is really liturgy in the broad sense) there is misdirected effort, meanness, incompetence, vulgarity, cacophony.

What is all this? What is all the noise for on the one hand, and silence on the other? All this welter of confusion and incompetence on the part of the few, and the mute inertia or balked despair of the many? What does it all mean or stand for? For whose delight is it created? Here is a lovely place of worship which the precise knowledge, judgment, skill, and devotion of our forefathers have raised; pious hands have maintained it; it was built to enshrine a noble liturgy, and a noble liturgy is still

prescribed to be celebrated in it; devoted labours have been spent on building up a faithful group of children, who have at least learnt the duty of attending the Lord's service week by week—clearly so, if forty still come although their teacher is withdrawn (the living has been vacant for months). What effect can this chaotic and ill-conceived music have, week after week, upon the minds of children who in their secular schools are daily learning to love folksong and the healthiest music that the educational authorities can find? There they have no difficulty in singing a wholesome tune without being propped up by an organ. What has happened that the lumbering machine which blots the chancel is allowed to dictate the type of music and then spread devastation over the whole act of worship by creating what is nothing better than a musical rubbish heap?

These are hard words, and I hasten to add that they are no direct attack on an individual, but on a state of affairs which is rife in our village churches. In the present nature of things, there must frequently be salaried incompetence enthroned on the organ bench. It is no shame to the organist, who is probably a self-taught man, and paid a mere pittance. For the more conventional services of the day to which the farmers and their families will come, a curtailment of organ accompaniment may be impracticable. But at a children's service, in the building up of a new tradition, where there are no prejudices to overcome, no feelings to be hurt, why is it assumed that the organ must be the foundation of any musical effort, the source and pivot of all musical utterance? Far more likely will it be a cloke of incompetence, an encouragement of slackness, and a source of trivial banality. Clearly a sense of proportion must be restored, and the idea combated that voices-plus-organ is the norm. On the contrary, the norm of expression must be voices alone; achieve that (as in the schools), and in one stroke 75 per cent. of the vulgarity is doomed.

What is the remedy? Are there any steps by which a cleaner and more wholesome standard may be achieved? Surely there are many.

First I want to see some sort of diocesan organization for instructing and inspecting. The magnificent Report of the Archbishop's Committee on *Music in Worship* (S.P.C.K. 1s.) has laid sure and broad foundations. But its field is immense, and practically it has not filtered down nearly far enough yet. (How many clergy, or organists, have read it?) I want to see its aims applied to small villages through diocesan channels, by some strong official encouragement that is only short of compulsion to ensure that any parish embarking on a Sung Eucharist (especially one at which children are to be encouraged) may have

the services of an instructor for a limited period, and may then expect the tonic of a periodic inspection and be at liberty to apply for a refresher course. But the instruction must be directed first to the nave and then the choir stalls (if, indeed, they are to be occupied), and the inspection must be, not of a choir rehearsal, but of an actual service. Instructor and inspector will not be drawn from the Cathedral: the Cathedral has its own problems, which are not those of the village church.

I want to ensure, too, that the instructors and inspectors are concerned primarily, perhaps exclusively, with the bare skeleton of essentials for singing the communion office decently without the aid of the organ—Creed, *Sursum Corda*, *Sanctus*, Our Father, *Gloria*, *Amens*, in fact the Common Prayers, to a common tune; secondly, that their technical ability is fortified by some practical knowledge of liturgics. They must know the ceremonial and liturgical lie of the ground; in fact they must be artists. In other words, they must be out for good workmanship; that is all.

Then I want a book—this is most important—which will be disseminated by the instructors. It will be called the *Diocesan Communion Book* and will be put into the hands of every person, child or adult, who comes to the service. It will be very like that excellent little manual *Our Bounden Duty*, published by Mowbray and Co.; it will contain the whole of the Communion office without exhortations or lessons; it may have a picture or two to illustrate a simple ceremonial, but it will contain little explanatory matter, and the barest minimum of private prayers—perhaps none. To make up it will have the notes of Merbecke's Creed set clearly over the words, and likewise the old music of *Sursum Corda*, the *Sanctus*, the *Agnus*, the Our Father (perhaps Merbecke, or perhaps Merbecke's master), and the simple three-note plainsong *Gloria* that children can learn by heart in half an hour. Perhaps the older traditional tune for the Creed might be included in an appendix, but the music must be printed in the body of the service. The book must look like a book, not sheets of music, and it must look generous and be printed beautifully with good open type; it need not be expensive to be beautiful. In fact it must be the sort of book without a good supply of which no parish priest could dream of embarking on a Sung Eucharist; and it will be so valuable that it will be worth a subsidy from diocesan funds.

And I want there to be a *League of the Creed and Gloria*, the members of which will be pledged to learn the common tunes by which they may sing all those parts of the Eucharist that it is their duty and privilege to sing. Clerical members will pledge themselves to refuse any music whatever at their children's

Eucharist until all can sing the bare essentials of worship. A knot of members may gather for an odd ten minutes in the Children's Corner to learn a phrase or two of "Glory be to God on high." What more suitable? On Sunday afternoon at Catechism, instruction on the Creed, say, may well include another ten minutes on its common musical utterance. Perhaps a branch of the League will have special claims on a diocesan instructor.

There are many obvious details that might be filled in, many more boons to ask, but here is enough to start with. Instruction, simplicity, united endeavour, infectious enthusiasm, the delight of good workmanship.

Is all this a wild dream? Why should it be? Is it more than the clearing away of useless clutter and lumber, a tidying up and making sweet and comely, an opening of windows to let pure air blow in, fresh and wholesome? It is more, of course, for it is a shaking off of fetters, a setting free, a clearing the decks for action. It is the building of an enduring edifice, and an insurance that musical endeavours, however pious in intent, shall not hinder and cramp and spoil the loveliness of worship.

J. H. ARNOLD.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

WE have received a copy of a very useful little book of prayers compiled by Mrs. Guy Rogers, and published by the Student Christian Movement (cloth, 3s., paper, 2s.) under the title of *Morning Prayers*. The prayers, which cover a wide range, are suitable for family use at home, and we have also found the book helpful at services in church or in the open air, etc. Occasionally there are words or phrases which one may not like; but in such cases alteration is easy, and we do not suppose that any compiler would object to this. A book of prayers is not so much a book of words as a book of suggestions; and we extend to this one a most cordial welcome.

We regret that Dr. Rawlinson was erroneously described on p. 302 of our last issue as "Archdeacon of Durham." He is, of course, Archdeacon of Auckland.

LITURGICA

I

My friend Dr. Lowther Clarke invites me to comment on his remarks with reference to the posture of the celebrant (1) during the Confession and (2) while he reads the Epistle.

(1) His conclusion as to the former is that the celebrant should kneel and join vocally in the Confession, even though it be led by another minister (i.e., by a clerk in Holy Orders). This, he says, is what the rubrics order. But the obvious liturgical impropriety of the celebrant's devotions being led by someone else surely encourages us to enquire whether it is absolutely necessary to interpret the rubric in this way. Dr. Lowther Clarke only begins his enquiry with the year 1548. But the Confession before the Communion was not a new invention of that year. Since about the thirteenth century it had been customary for the clerk or server to say the *Confiteor* at this point on behalf of the communicants on the few occasions when there were any. This Confession was made either immediately after the Priest's Communion, or possibly, as is the present Roman custom, while he was actually engaged in communicating. In either case it is clear that he would be standing, and would not join in it. The Order of Communion enacts that the new form of Confession is to be made either by a communicant, or by one of the ministers, or by the Priest, all kneeling; and adds before the Absolution, "Then shall the Priest stand up." The literal interpretation of this is no doubt as Dr. Lowther Clarke asserts; but is it not possible, in view of tradition and liturgical propriety, to interpret "All kneeling" as most of us are accustomed to interpret the same phrase when it occurs before the Collect at Morning and Evening Prayer? If so, the phrase "Then shall the Priest stand up" will only refer to the case where he himself has said the Confession—i.e., presumably, when there is no one else present who is capable of doing so. It is surely probable that Catholic-minded priests during the reign of Edward VI. would make the minimum of change from the old ways, and continue to stand as they had been accustomed to do. If this is so, there is nothing further in the 1661 rubric to necessitate the kneeling posture on the part of the Priest. Strict

legalism would no doubt bring him to his knees before the Confession so that he might be in a position to "stand up" (as distinct from merely *standing*) for the Absolution; but are we really compelled to observe rubrics with such extreme scrupulosity?

Nor does the standing posture necessarily mean "ostentatious" dissociation from the people's confession of sin. In places where the mutual confession between the Priest and his assistants has come to be recognized as part of the service, the Priest will perhaps occupy himself with other prayers if there is someone else to lead the people's confession; but to stand is the celebrant's normal attitude of prayer, and the mere fact of standing does not in itself imply inattention.

(2) As to the Epistle, there is no doubt a strong case to be made for reading it towards the people at High Mass, when it is read by a subdeacon from a slim and light volume containing nothing but the Epistles. In that case he may well carry it to the chancel step, or better still, to a *pulpitum* or ambo, if the church possesses one. It is of High Mass that Fortescue is writing when he says that the Eastward position is "quite anomalous." It is obviously the reaction of the familiar Low Mass ceremonial upon High Mass. But surely Dr. Lowther Clarke is mistaken when he says that according to Roman authority the Priest must hold the book in his hands even at Low Mass, and infers that the awkwardness of holding up a heavy missal cannot be the reason for the Eastward position. The rubric reads: "positis super librum, vel super Altare, manibus, ita ut palmæ librum turgent, vel (ut placuerit) librum tenens." He *may* pick the book up, but the invariable practice is for him to leave the book on the missal-stand. The reason is clear. The book is too heavy to hold conveniently, and he therefore treats the Altar as the *pulpitum* for the time being.

The real question seems to be whether we are justified in following the rubrics of the Missal when our own give no clear guidance. If so, perhaps it is better to follow them through thick and thin, even to the extent of reading the Epistle Eastward at High Mass (if there is no ambo). After all it need make no difference to audibility.

(3) Now may I raise a little point of my own? Is there anything whatever to be said for kneeling almost all through the principal Eucharist on Sundays? The custom of kneeling for solemn public prayer seems to be a merely Anglican tradition and an unofficial one at that. Kneeling is the attitude of penitence, of adoration (outside the Liturgy) and (optionally) of private prayer. It was forbidden for public prayer on Sundays by no less an authority than the Council of Nicæa. In the Latin rite the liturgical choir stands, or sits, for the whole service, except that non-singers kneel during the *Confiteor* and other preparatory prayers, and that all kneel for the Consecration and the blessing; and sitting is of course not thought of as a leisurely form of kneeling, but as a rest from standing. It is true that the Latin rubric orders those whom it strangely styles *circumstantes* to kneel at a private Mass; but even then the rubric does not seem to be generally or strictly observed. There is no official kneeling in the Orthodox rite. Non-episcopalians, of course, very seldom kneel at all. Nor do the Anglican rubrics make any mention of kneeling except for the Ten Commandments, the Confession, and the Prayer of Humble Access. Indeed, the bidding to kneel which occurs just before the Confession seems to imply that those addressed are *not* already in that position.

Certainly there is no need to attempt to dragoon the congregation in the matter. It might indeed be better if there were far more freedom where they are concerned. But there do seem to be decided advantages in the standing posture, at least for the official choir. (1) It suggests that they are doing the same thing as the celebrant, namely, offering a sacrifice. (2) It avoids weariness on the one hand and lazy lolling on the other. (3) It is a much better position in which to sing. (4) It is in accordance with the ceremonial law of the Universal Church.

The idea that we must kneel when the Blessed Sacrament is upon the Altar seems to ignore the *reason* for which it is thereupon. The standing posture, especially during the silent prayer which follows the Consecration, is a witness to the fact that the priests in choir, and even in a sense the laymen, concelebrate with the actual celebrant. Might we not then agree that, while the congregation may do "as each man's devotion serveth," the liturgical choir, whether clerks or laymen, should, on Sundays and festivals, stand for the Collect, the Prayer for the Church, the Preface and *Sanctus*, and that after the Consecration they should rise again and remain standing for the silent prayers after the Consecration as well as for the *Agnus Dei* and the final prayer (whether of Oblation or Thanksgiving), kneeling only for the Communion of the people (if there are communicants) and for the final Blessing?

KENNETH D. MACKENZIE.

II

THE CONFITEOR

A correspondent asks whether there is any precedent for two confessions in one Rite, such as occur when the priest, having made his confession at the beginning of the service, repeats it in the form provided by the Prayer Book. Evidently the same doubt arose in the minds of the English Bishops when they revised the Prayer Book, for the preparatory devotion provided in the Appendix of the 1928 Book gives Psalm xliii. with versicles and responses but omits the mutual *Confiteor*. It may be answered: Why should the server be asked to confess *his* sins twice? If it is not fitting for the celebrant, nor is it for the server. But there is precedent for two confessions. (a) The Eastern Liturgies are full of repetitions. The clearest for our purpose is the Liturgy of the Syrian Jacobites. The Celebrant, as part of his preparation, "asks pardon of the priests and the people. And he says (Ps. li.)" (Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 69). Afterwards, between the epiclesie and the fraction, the priest prays: "Remit, forgive, O God, our offences, done voluntarily and involuntarily, wittingly and unwittingly, by word and deed and in thought, those that are hidden and those that are manifest. . . ." (p. 96).

(b) Modern Roman practice teaches the congregation to follow the Mass closely. A good manual is *The Mass* by J. A. Dunney (Sands, London). Of the first *Confiteor* the author says: "The people say it (through the server) to the priest," following James v. 16 (p. 17). Later (p. 305): "If any of the faithful are to receive Communion, the altar boy says the *Confiteor*. People should do the same. . . . The priest . . . pronounces the Absolution." The *Agnus Dei* and *Domine, non sum dignus* follow, and then the Communion. "This little ritual, apparently not earlier than the twelfth century, which is only a repetition of prayers already

said, must have been at first, so it is thought, the ritual of the communion distributed outside Mass" (Dom Cabrol in *Liturgia*, p. 552). Similarly the Anglican *Confiteor* has been taken from the 1568 Order of Communion. With the growth of non-communicating attendance there is no reason why a *Confiteor* preparatory to the whole Rite should not be supplemented by one specially designed for communicants. From this point of view the celebrant is the one person who should in every case say the second *Confiteor*.

W. K. L. C.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

Luke i. 27.—THE VIRGIN'S NAME WAS MARY

NEXT to the holy name of our Saviour, the name most frequently on the lips of the faithful is the name of His blessed mother, for most Christians recite the Creed and many add the *Ave Maria* to their prayers as a memorial of the incarnation. As a Christian name in England it is borne by all classes of women from the Queen downward.

Mary and Mariamne are Greek forms of Miriam. The first Mary of whom we read in the Bible was the sister of Moses and Aaron. As a girl she had watched from a distance what would happen to her little brother in the ark of bulrushes, and at the bidding of Pharaoh's daughter went and fetched her mother to act as nurse to the child. She became a prominent woman in Israel, and was known as a prophetess. It was natural that Jewish mothers should love to give to their girls the name of such a famous heroine. The woman who led the songs of the Israelites when they saw their enemies lying dead on the sea shore was, as far as we know, the first owner of the name which was to be most highly honoured among women.

At the time of the Incarnation the name seems to have been common, probably in expectation of deliverance from the bondage which galled the Jews like that of Egypt of old. At least five other Marias, besides our Lord's mother, are mentioned in the New Testament. Some think the popularity of the name at this period was partly due to the sympathy felt for the beautiful Hasmonean princess, the high-souled and ill-fated wife of Herod the Great. In Mariamne the brave Maccabean line was extinguished.

In nearly all civilized countries some ceremony is connected with giving a name to children. Amongst the Jews at the present day boys, of course, receive a name at their circumcision. In the case of girls the ceremony of name-giving takes place in the Synagogue on the first Sabbath after birth, but it is often deferred to a Sabbath when the mother can be present for the first time after her confinement. After the ceremony the relatives and friends assemble at the parents' house for congratulations and hospitality.

The importance attached to names makes the study of them a valuable means to appreciating the religious and social life of the Hebrews. The name given to a child often indicated some natural feature belonging to it, or something connected with the circumstances of its birth or the public affairs of the time, or expressed some characteristic which the fond parents hoped it would possess when it grew up, or, in some cases, expressed their gratitude to God for the gift of offspring. Yet the selection of a name was, and still is, in the East, often dictated by some accidental

circumstance, as by a word spoken at the child's birth, or by some object which chanced to meet the eye of the mother. Luke i. 60-62 seems to show that the name given by the mother was subject to correction by the father. Gray asserts that the explanations of personal names, as given in the Old Testament, do not generally coincide with their true etymological meaning, but arise from some similarity of sound to a word that gave what appeared subsequently a suitable significance to the name.

The meaning of the name Mary is uncertain, because its derivation is not clear. The *nominum interpretatio* appended to the ordinary Latin Bible gives its meaning as *exaltata*, or *amartudinis mare*. "Bitterness" is accepted by some as the most satisfactory meaning. Miriam may have received such a name in allusion to the bitter bondage in which she was born. "Call me not Pleasantness (Naomi), but Bitterness (Mara)," said the desolate mother-in-law of Ruth. And *mater dolorosa* is a familiar title of the mother of Christ. Hebrew scholars, however, tell us that מִרְיָם (exalted) and מָרָר (bitter) are both impossible, because the form of the name Miriam cannot be derived from these roots.

It seems that there are two possible roots from which the name can come.

The first is מָרָר, meaning stubborn, contentious, or rebellious. This is the derivation given by Gensenius, but it seems improbable that a new-born child would be called "Rebellious" by its mother.

The other possible root is מָרָא, meaning fat or plump. This might well be a name bestowed by the gratified parent, for in the East fatness was, and is, an element of female beauty. We are therefore left to suppose that Amram and Jochebed called their daughter Miriam because, though born in hard times, she was a fine, plump child. Moses was, we are told, "a handsome boy," and probably his sister was equally fair.

Possibly her name (like that of Moses) may have been of Egyptian origin, but, apparently, no corresponding Egyptian form has been discovered.

It is generally considered that the proper pronunciation of Miriam has been preserved, not in the Hebrew, but in the LXX and the Targum. Miriam is properly *Μαριάμ* or *Maryam*. The final *μ* was often dropped in Greek, so *Μαριάμ* became *Μαρία* (in Luke i. 46 the full form is given). The form Miriam never occurs in the Vulgate, Maria being used both in the Old Testament and the New. In the East Miriam seems to be the popular form—e.g., Mary's well at Nazareth is called Ain Miryam.

Miss Yonge, in her *History of Christian Names*, points out the interesting fact that the name of our Lord's mother was very slow in coming into use as a Christian name in the West. The first Maria whom she could find of undoubtedly western birth was a Spanish maiden who was martyred by the Moors at Cordova in 851. It seems that it was the devotion of the Crusaders that first brought the name into popular use in Europe. Having come through the French, it was spelt in their fashion (Marie), till the translation of the Bible into English made the present form familiar.* Mary II. was the first of our queens who dropped the *ie*.

Our English forms are Maria, Mary, Marion, Moll, Molly, Polly, Malkin, Mawkes, Mawkin, and May, with Marriott and Marryat as surnames. But surely Marie is much prettier, besides being more correct. Mair is a Welsh, Moissey a Manx, and Mari an Irish form of the name.

* Wycliffe (1332) has Marie, Tyndale (1534) Mary, Cranmer (1539) Mary, Geneva (1557) Marie, Rheims (1533) Marie, A.V. (1611) Marie.

REVIEWS

BERENGAR AND THE REFORM OF SACRAMENTAL DOCTRINE.

By A. J. Macdonald, D.D. Longmans. 21s.

Dr. Macdonald's *Lanfranc* (1926) was an excellent piece of work, not the least valuable part of which was his account of its hero's polemic with his quondam friend Berengar of Tours concerning the chief points of Eucharistic doctrine then in dispute. It was obviously impossible in the story of a life of such varied interests as was that of Lanfranc to give to a single controversy, however important, the fullness of treatment which it deserved. Dr. Macdonald was therefore happily inspired, in writing a full-length study of the life and work of Berengar, to review the whole history of Eucharistic speculation and controversy which culminated in the definitions of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215).

Berengar is for us little more than a figure of controversy. The first part of Dr. Macdonald's book is the most elaborate and satisfactory account of his career which has yet appeared, the result of careful research into documents which were not available when Professor Schnitzer of Munich published the only other considerable life of the Scholasticus of Tours in 1890. Here for the first time for English readers the man himself is presented to us in the ecclesiastical and political surroundings which so largely determined the nature and character of his life-work. His theological training in the schools of Chartres and Tours, his friendship with Hildebrand and Lanfranc, the history of the various Councils in which he was condemned, and the political influences which affected the course of the long-continued struggle—all these are given with a fullness which leaves nothing to be desired and with a solidity of judgment which inspires confidence in the faithfulness of the picture.

But it is on the second part of Dr. Macdonald's book, his general history of the Eucharistic controversy, that the interest of the theological student will naturally concentrate. The Berengarian Controversy is for most of us a mere episode, without any considerable antecedents, without consequence other than the complete and final repudiation of Berengar's own positions by the full consensus of Church tradition. Dr. Macdonald shows convincingly that this was not at all the actual historical state of affairs, that on the contrary both Berengar and his opponents had behind them rival conceptions of the Divine Presence in the Eucharist which could each claim the highest authority. These conceptions he calls "dynamic

symbolism" and "metabolism," and assigns their origin to the authority of Augustine and Ambrose respectively. By "dynamic symbolism" he means the doctrine of such a change in the elements wrought by the act of consecration as makes them the vehicles of a Divine self-impartation to those who receive the Sacrament. By "metabolism" he means the doctrine of a real, substantial change of the elements into the substance of the Lord's Body and Blood. It is perhaps unnecessary to say that Dr. Macdonald does not claim that these doctrines stand opposed to each other in the beginnings of Eucharistic controversy with all the stark definiteness implied in these definitions. On the contrary, he shows quite clearly by a minute analysis of all the pertinent writings from at least the ninth century down to the thirteenth how gradual and how often confused the actual differentiation was. The protagonists on each side at each of the great moments of the controversy—Paschasius and Ratramn or Scotus Erigena in the ninth century, Berengar and Lanfranc or Guitmund in the eleventh—did of course stress to the utmost the one or other of these conceptions for which each stood. But even they paid at least lip service to the opposite conception and no doubt honestly felt that they were duly interpreting whatever claims upon Christian belief it could legitimately make, while their followers show a still greater vacillation and often commit themselves to statements which are at least logically contradictory. The same may be said of Augustine and Ambrose themselves. Indeed, it ought to be more fully recognized than it generally is that the aim of the Fathers, and especially of the Western Fathers, was not at all to formulate correct theological definitions, but to establish, or rather to preserve, what we would now call the full religious values of the various contents of Revelation. To that end and to that end only were the "dynamic symbolism" of Augustine and the "realist metabolism" of Ambrose meant to minister. Augustine's doctrine is unquestionably, taken as a whole, what Dr. Macdonald calls "dynamic symbolism," and that just because he felt that the religious stress ought to lie that way. But he never thought of denying, nay, he felt that he was the more surely affirming, by that doctrine of his, the sense in which the Sacrament was "really" the Lord's Body. So, too, the realism of Ambrose, an expression of his Roman mental temperament, legalist and literal, was but his mode of being true to the witness of Revelation and did not at all necessarily imply, though no doubt it supplied the necessary foundation for, the full-blown theological metabolism.

Not the least interesting feature of Dr. Macdonald's work is

its recognition of the true moment of the theological dawn. His treatment begins with the "false dawn" of the ninth century. It continues through that preparation of the true dawn which the eleventh century represented. It ends with the authentic birth of theology proper in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries themselves. He sees clearly that what the ninth and eleventh centuries did was to discuss particular doctrines with the aid of patristic authority, while the task which the twelfth century quite consciously imposed upon itself was the welding of the various elements of the traditional belief into a harmonious and self-consistent whole. It is therefore during the ninth and eleventh centuries that Eucharistic doctrine was taking definite shape by a utilization of the various strands of patristic tradition. Personal predilection, as determined by specific religious temperament, would naturally dictate the choice, instinctive rather than fully conscious, of authorities by the individual thinker. But behind all the process of thought, sometimes attracting it, sometimes stirring it to critical opposition, there worked always the crude realism of popular cultus with its demand for miracle in its grossest and most material forms. This was the really determining factor in the intellectual form which Christian belief was in the end to assume. Yet, as we know, the first attempt on the great scale to intellectualize popular belief, that of Paschasius, was immediately met by Ratramn's vigorous reaffirmation of the Augustinian positions. Two centuries later—centuries during which the intellect of Christendom had become almost atrophied—Paschasius' doctrine seemed definitely to have won the day when it was challenged by Berengar, somewhere about the middle year of the century. It is not wonderful, therefore, if the doctrine of Berengar, especially as fully developed in the *De Sacra Cænâ*, seemed to the ordinary orthodox theologian of his time an unwarranted and even monstrous novelty. No sooner, indeed, had it appeared than it was felled by the *coup de bâton* of authority and officially buried beneath the weight of repeated condemnations.

Yet Dr. Macdonald's careful and generally illuminating analysis of all the relevant writings of Berengar's contemporaries and immediate successors makes it clear that his influence remained to check in some measure the wilder excesses of realism. It is true that in so far as his doctrine was a denial of a "real" presence in the Eucharist in any other than the Augustinian sense he had no followers. But his criticism of the crude Paschasian realism had raised questions which led to more careful and restrained statements of realist doctrine. All this, however, was forgotten with the triumph of metabolism

at the Lateran Council. Even for the Bohemian Church and for Luther the Berengarian doctrine was heresy *tout court*. Wycliff and Calvin, on the other hand, and a succession of English divines, from Ridley to Cosin, returned to the dynamic symbolism of Berengar as the most sufficient statement of the nature of the Sacrament.

This is the story which Dr. Macdonald has told in the most conscientious detail with solid learning, strict impartiality, and a praiseworthy clearness of exposition. His book is a notable contribution to theological literature and has, it is almost unnecessary to add, a special interest for English Churchmen of today. It will do us an immense service if it takes us back to a fresh consideration not only of the doctrine of Berengar himself, but also and more especially of the patristic sources from which that doctrine was derived.

A. L. LILLEY.

THE ART OF MENTAL PRAYER. By the Rev. Bede Frost.
Philip Allan. 8s. 6d.

This is an unique and valuable book, and one which, in the words of the Abbot of Pershore, "may be commended not only to the notice, but to also the careful and above all devout study, of those called upon to direct souls."

It is unique in that it gathers together, for the first time so far as I am aware, clear expositions of no less than seven classical methods of meditation—the Ignatian, Franciscan, Carmelite, Salesian, Liguorian, and Oratorian—together with first-hand quotation of the great authorities. These explanations are the core of the book and its *raison d'être*, and are based on a thorough study of the masters of the schools of spirituality represented, combined with practical experience.

Had he written no more than the second part of his book Fr. Bede Frost would have provided the busy priest with a conspectus of methods useful for different kinds of souls which would be of the greatest value for direction; but he has done more than this, for, in the first and third parts, he discusses the nature of the Christian life, as well as the nature of mental prayer and its necessity for all Christians, the difficulties experienced in prayer, preparation for and progress in it and the direction of souls therein, with an appendix containing an analysis of the first book of *The Dark Night of the Soul* and a comprehensive bibliography. The book, therefore, covers a wide field which is greatly in need of elucidation, and, except for a few details, the author's exposition is sound and his advice wise.

In his criticisms of present-day religion and his brother

clergy he is less happy. He feels acutely our shortcomings, mistakes, and neglect of the "good part," and apparently sees little else. His criticisms would be more valuable if they were less generalized and more balanced—*e.g.*, it is not accurate to say without qualification, "Religion has become merely a synonym for morality, philanthropy, and self-improvement" (p. 12), or, "People are profoundly lacking in *any* true conception of God and of their relation to Him" (p. 236), even though one deplores the truth which underlies these sweeping statements. When Fr. Bede Frost refers to the clergy it is always to draw attention to their incompetence in the matter of prayer and direction, and much of what he says is true, yet there are among us competent directors and priests who both pray themselves and teach their people from real knowledge of the "solid, enduring, indispensable books on the spiritual life and the practice of prayer," while the ignorance he rightly deplores is often due, not to laziness or neglect, but to the difficulty of knowing what to read—a difficulty which this book should do much to reduce. There are movements of prayer going on amongst us to which our author never even alludes, and it is an exaggeration to say that "only a very few, even among the clergy and laity who make Retreats, know of, and actually live, lives of prayer, and, if they have attempted to do so, they are usually in a very elementary stage, making little or no progress for want of knowledge. Most of them have never been taught clearly" (pp. 3-4).

In spite of the movements to which I have alluded it is, I think, true to say, with Fr. Bede Frost, that there is "a certain 'gap' in teaching and practice which, to a much larger extent than is generally recognized, nullifies and renders sterile all the considerable progress which has been, and is being, made. That 'gap' is the absence of insistence upon, and the practice of, mental prayer" (p. 3). We are over-inclined to regard mental prayer as an exercise proper for priests and pious ladies, but unnecessary for busy people, confining the meaning of the term to the most complex of the methods of St. Ignatius. As a result most people are content with vocal prayer, some attempt to meditate and give up in despair, while others who feel the call to prayer and cannot profitably meditate in the "Ignatian" way seek satisfaction in more mystical ways of prayer to which they are not always called and which they do not always understand.

More souls are designed by God for contemplative prayer than we commonly recognize, but "contemplation, unless preceded by meditation, is dangerous for the soul" because it lacks a solid background; consequently, instruction in medita-

tion is of the greatest importance. It is here that the book before us is of particular use in showing, not only that our "Ignatian" method is not the only one taught by the saint, but also that there are other methods which help souls which should meditate but cannot do so in this particular way. It lays solid foundations for those souls whom God would call to "come up higher," and offers wide pastures to all beginners in the spiritual life.

The title of the book is open to some misunderstanding, since Mental Prayer is commonly understood with a wider extension than our author would give it. It is necessary to remember that in this book Mental Prayer means Meditation in its widest sense, not Mental Prayer in general as opposed to vocal. Further, it is not accurate to say that Mental Prayer, even in this sense, is "*enclosed* within methods." The purpose of method is not to confine the soul, but to provide a path whereby it may ascend to God.

Fr. Bede Frost says that his book is for "the clergy, religious and devout laity." For the clergy and those whose business it is to train either clergy, religious, or the laity in prayer it is indeed invaluable, but for those who are seeking a way of prayer for themselves it is not suitable. It is to be feared that the devout layman on attempting to assimilate all the methods here described might meet the sad fate of the chameleon which, on being placed on a tartan, made a gallant attempt to turn all colours at once and—burst!

Indeed, our author is not always wise in recommending books for general reading. On p. 40 he says: "Anyone who is attracted to the subject (of mystical prayer) would do well to begin by a careful reading of the first seven chapters of the *Dark Night of the Soul*, by St. John of the Cross, and by a good use of the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius." It is true that he specifies the first seven chapters of the former work, but it is unlikely that anyone who read so far would stop there, and a wise director is careful not to allow beginners to read St. John of the Cross, while Fr. Bede Frost himself remarks on p. 159: "It is not unnecessary to warn beginners not to read spiritual books treating of the higher states of prayer. There are few which are not liable to misunderstanding by those who have little knowledge of both theology and the spiritual life, and such may easily fall into delusions about their state." As to the latter book, our author says on p. 49: "It was not meant to be put into the hands of retreatants or others, nor were the exercises to be given indiscriminately to all."

The Holy Spirit is, as our author points out, the only ultimate teacher of prayer and the only ultimate director of souls, and

no way of praying is right for any soul to which it is not called by God, nevertheless the normal method of the Spirit is, as Mr. Holden pointed out years ago, indirect—*i.e.*, by means of human media. There is in some minds an almost ineradicable prejudice against any method in prayer, such method being regarded as a confining of the Spirit; but method of some kind is necessary to all prayer, and in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries God raised up a succession of holy souls who gathered up the traditional mental prayer of the Church into the methods before us. God is leading many souls to seek Him in prayer today, and a careful and reverent study and practice of the teaching of such guides may well bring about in our time and country a reformation comparable to that wrought in seventeenth-century France.

F. P. HARTON.

NOTICES

THE THINGS THAT ARE NOT CÆSAR'S. By Jacques Maritain. Translated by J. F. Scanlan. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

The English translator of M. Maritain's *Primauté du Spirituel* has done his best to obscure the scope of the book by the title which he has given to it. For the argument is entirely concerned with the influence of the spiritual authority of the Papacy in matters temporal, and these are precisely the charge allotted to Cæsar in the famous antithesis. In his passage from Bergson to Aquinas M. Maritain has discovered the solidarity of human society under God, *Creator et Ordinator*: a solidarity which is not marred by the institution of two social orders, the temporal, which is purely social, and the spiritual, which is social and something more. These are, therefore, not quite equal. According to the philosophy of Ends, the spiritual is superior because its end is the ultimate beatitude of man in heaven, while the end of the temporal is only the Good Life here on earth. Moreover, the spiritual also is concerned with this Good Life. Therefore, on all accounts, the spiritual must be able on occasion to intervene in the concerns of the temporal. The Pope is, as God's vicerent, the one supreme head of the spiritual order: various forms of government represent Cæsar in the temporal order, and have no title to intervene in the spiritual order.

The scheme is beautifully simple, but the one-sided right of intervention causes some difficulty. M. Maritain sets himself to oppose a theory, recently put forward, that three different kinds of power in temporals have at different times been exercised by the Pope: (1) direct, (2) indirect, and (3) directive, the last being distinguished as not imperative but advisory. He maintains, on the contrary, that the Pope's power in temporals is essentially unalterable, the same at the beginning, now, and to the end of time, the only variation being in the *mode* of action. He concludes (1) that the theory of *direct* action was a mere speculation of theologians or canonists in the later Middle Ages; (2) that *indirect* action *ratione peccati*, as defined by Bellarmine, was the only mode used until

recent times; and (3) that the Pope, wisely accommodating himself to present circumstances, voluntarily confines himself to the mode of *directive* action. The power itself is "practically unlimited," extending to the deposition of temporal rulers, the annulment of temporal laws, and the prohibition of political theories or policies—always *ratione peccati*; but the Pope refrains at the present time from these extreme measures, and confines himself to wholesome teaching and advice. Yet Pius X. did decree the "annulment" of the French *Loi de séparation*. The word "practically" seems to be used in a special sense. A vast amount of ingenuity is expended in fitting to this theological scheme various facts of history superficially recalcitrant.

T. A. LACEY.

THE FALL OF CHRISTIANITY: A STUDY OF CHRISTIANITY, THE STATE, AND WAR. By G. J. Heering, Doctor of Theology. Translated by J. W. Thompson. George Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.

This powerful book is as uncompromising as the utterance of a Hebrew prophet. The author allows less for considerations of historical relativity than does Don Luigi Sturzo, in the latter's *International Community and the Right of War*, a recent powerful work containing a similar line of argument.

Dr. Heering indicts the entire Church since Constantine with having "suppressed the primitive Christian values" as to the question of war.

His deepest condemnation is reserved for Luther's attitude. The latter's teaching left the main regions of sociology practically outside the *Regnum Christi*, the latter being limited to individual salvation and the domestic sphere.

Later, Machiavellianism became invested with ethical sanctions by such writers as Fichte and Hegel, *Staatsräson* or "political expediency" becoming in theory as well as in practice the highest law of thought and morals for the modern Commonwealth.

The Lutheran failure in political and social ethics led to a vacant niche for the canonization of Machiavelli by the great Prussian publicists and philosophers. Heering styles this "the legitimation of a bastard."

As to Calvinism, he holds that it involved a virile and world-subduing spirit, absent in Luther's movement. His judgment as to the attitude of the international communion of Rome in regard to the war problem is a discriminating one, noting her elasticity, but not unsuspecting of expediency and of the influence of environment. But he uses and praises a noble Roman Catholic contribution to the cause of peace, the *Weltkirche und Weltfriede* of Fr. Stratmann, O.P., of Munich.

In regard to Anglo-Saxon Puritanism, Dr. Heering points out the manner in which Methodist and similar softening types have so influenced and modified the originally Calvinistic temper that the latter has largely lost its fierce Old Testament and Cromwellian character and is becoming more and more practically pacifist in sympathy.

The unchanged and unchanging, even if lonely, conviction of the Society of Friends, of course, touches Dr. Heering deeply. He views it as the Abdiel of Modern Christendom, faithful among the faithless.

Uncompromising as is Dr. Heering's idealism, its atmosphere is not that of the abstract, removed from life and experience. Much of this work consists of solid and well-documented history, of facts marshalled in the service of ethical purpose.

We lay down this noble book with the conviction that its message lies in the main stream along which the life of the spirit is moving, as, in its course, the latter touches "to fine issues" the thought and feeling of what is best in the post-Europe of today.

C. E. OSBORNE.

THE STRUCTURE OF THOUGHT: A SURVEY OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY. By Ludwig Fischer. Translated by W. H. Johnston, B.A. Allen and Unwin. 16s.

We have here an excellent translation of an important and distinctive work, *Die natürliche Ordnung unseres Denkens*. In line with Hegel and Fichte it makes an advance in description of the essential form and content of experience.

The author seeks to discover the axiomatic concept within whose framework all the propositions of science must lie. This "prime form," exhibiting the general structure of thought, he finds in the form of "opposition in unity," exemplified in the primary forms of space and time and knowledge, but implied in all aspects of experience. It is a theory of radical relativism. The claim is that the two terms, multiplicity and unity, constitute a fundamental relation, beyond which knowledge cannot pass: terms and relations are not separable either in fact or for knowledge, and the mental distinction made between them as distinct "poles" of thought is only a necessary fiction. Knowledge itself oscillates between two poles which are meaningless except in a relation which constitutes their unity.

It is plain that the dialectic of Hegel is here reduced to an antithesis, manifested in various ways, within Nature. It might be possible to allow this restricted view of the scope of thought to determine an outlook upon the whole field of knowledge were it not for the actual qualitative differences within experience and which, for the ego, imply contrast, effort and aim. The distinctions "outer" and "inner" rest upon a judgment of value, and there are persistent elements in experience which escape from the net of this formula. It is, perhaps, significant of a certain limitation of interest that the historical survey does not include, *e.g.*, Rickert and Gentile, each characterized in his own way by a sense of the philosophical significance of history and of individuality.

From time to time logical systems, theories of the essential form of thought, arise. They can be used to impose restrictions upon the content of knowledge. On this it may be said that an intelligible world is their presupposition and the test and measure of their range and adequacy. One impressive result of scientific inquiry has been an enhanced appreciation of the wealth and complexity of "the mysterious universe," and the corresponding effect in philosophy has been recognition of the manifold significant aspects of its data. With this in mind it is possible to regard the limits of our knowledge, not so much as in Fischer's term, "fictional," but as "in part," with hope of the reduction of such limits.

F. W. BUTLER.

THE RUSSIAN CHURCH. By Nicholas Brian-Chaninov. Translated by Warre B. Wells. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 6s.

We reviewed this book some time ago, when it appeared in French. The translation appears to be competent, and is certainly very readable. The history of the Russian Church is treated from the Roman standpoint,

and the author is chiefly interested in his subject, not for its own sake, nor in relation to Christianity, but in relation to the Roman See. We observe that the astonishing career of Bishop Smotritzky (died 1633), who continued to serve as an orthodox bishop some years after he had secretly made his submission to Rome, in order that he might more easily devote himself to proselytism, and the still more astonishing fact that the author calls this dishonest rogue "a wise man, if not a saint," is in no way toned down in the translation (p. 81). Incidents like this are sufficient to explain the age-long hostility of Russian Orthodoxy to Rome. The Patriarch of Constantinople of that period, being unable to trust the bishops, organized the people in brotherhoods (*stavropigiales*), which were placed directly under the patriarchal control, and so resisted successfully the attempts of Rome and Poland to undermine the Orthodox Church by means of the higher clergy.

Since the book appeared in French, fresh matter has been added on recent events in Russia and the Russian Church. Accurate information is certainly difficult to obtain, but we are inclined to think that some of the author's statements, especially as to the political attitude of various Russian ecclesiastics of the exile, are not to be relied upon. His attitude towards the Anglican-Orthodox entente is entirely hostile and contemptuous.

The book throws little light on the real nature and history of the Russian Church, but is valuable as a guide to the Roman attitude towards Russian problems, and to the methods which Rome has no hesitation in using to gain her ends.

C. B. Moss.

PRAYERS FROM THE EASTERN LITURGIES. By Donald Attwater. Compiled from the offices in use by Catholics of the Eastern Rites. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 4s.

This is a collection of prayers from the Eastern liturgies as used by the Uniats, intended for private devotion. As far as we have been able to compare them with the original Eastern rites, there seems to be very little difference, except that in various places the Pope's name takes the place of those of the various patriarchs. On p. 84 is a reference to Purgatory, which can hardly be original; it is not stated in which liturgy it is to be found. It is wholly desirable that the Latins should widen the scope of their private devotions by using the beautiful prayers of the ancient Eastern liturgies; but we cannot but remember that the Uniat bodies (with the exception of the Italo-Greeks and the Maronites) are mere splinters chipped off from the ancient churches of the East, both Orthodox and Separated, to which these liturgies really belong, by the proselytizing agents of the Vatican.

C. B. Moss.

THE HARROWING OF HELL. By J. A. MacCulloch, D.D. T. and T. Clark. 12s.

The title of this book might lead the reader to expect an investigation of the motive which inspired some important works of art and literature in the Middle Ages; but though this aspect is not wholly neglected, Canon MacCulloch's aim is more comprehensive, and he has endeavoured, not without success, to trace the doctrine of the *descensus Christi ad inferos* through the whole history of the Church.

After adducing some analogies from other religions, he treats of the

Descent in the apostolic writings, in the Creeds and Church Orders, and in the Fathers: among the latter paying especial attention to St. Clement of Alexandria and Origen. At about this time the Descent attained considerable importance in Christian thought: the liberals (to use a dangerous word in no bad sense) could not believe that all the good pagans, who knew not of the Revelation owing to pure ignorance, should be condemned either to eternal suffering or to loss of something approaching the Beatific Vision, if not actually the Vision itself: and the Descent, and the preaching of Christ to the souls in prison, gave them a chance of assuming, without violence to the words of Holy Writ in orthodox tradition, that they had the advantage of that special dispensation between the tragedy of Good Friday and the glorious recovery of Easter. Some of the apocryphal writings carry this view to extremes: others make of it a lengthy, telling and dramatic story: one of the best of these is the "Gospel of Nicodemus," which Canon MacCulloch carefully describes in one of the best chapters of his book, though it must be remembered that in this the interest centres in the saints and other characters of the Old Testament rather than in the virtuous pagans.

Later chapters deal with incidents, so to speak, of the Descent, many of which are found in description or allusion in the "Gospel of Nicodemus"—the breaking of the Gates of Hades, the victory over Death and Hell (Hades), the preaching in Hades, the release of the souls there, and the resurrection of the saints. The Descent may be a comparatively small part of Christian doctrine, though it has at least found a place in the Creeds; but if any student desires to investigate all its developments and implications, he will hardly find a more complete and thorough treatise than this.

I have a feeling, if I may return to the words with which I began this review, that a little more might have been done on the artistic side, and that we should have been glad of some quotations from medieval hymns (there is not much here later than Venantius Fortunatus and Prudentius), and an illustration or two, Dürer's or another's. But that is perhaps a task for another investigation, and we owe Canon MacCulloch very warm thanks for the learned and satisfactory work which he has actually given us.

STEPHEN GASELEE.

LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN RESEARCH.

By Heinrich Boehmer. Translated by E. S. G. Potter. Bell. 16s.

The late Professor Boehmer's *Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung*—of which a translation has long been overdue—is essentially a book written by a scholar for scholars. Its scope and purpose are sufficiently indicated by the following quotation:

"We can never get to know the complete Luther if we allow our line of vision to be prescribed by his accusers. The complete Luther shows himself only to him who approaches Luther's personality with an open mind and, misled by neither friend nor foe, allows it to work upon him in all its strength and abundance. The negative result with which the four-hundred-year-long proceedings close thus requires a positive complement. But this task has been performed so often that it does not need to be performed again in its entirety. Only as regards the method to be followed, and certain features of Luther's character which most biographers have not interpreted rightly, a brief disquisition is necessary" (pp. 224-5).

This massive volume, then, does not contain a full-dress biography of Luther. It is rather in the nature of a commentary: the author surveys different aspects of the Reformer's life—The Evolution of the Reformer, The Evolution of the Reformation (to 1522), Luther as Scholar, Artist, Moralist, Thinker, Prophet—taking in his stride the work of previous biographers and correcting their errors as they occur. Grisar, in particular, is roughly handled from time to time, as might have been expected: Denifle is merely thrust aside. Much of the Luther legend fails to survive this searching investigation, but it is not without a pang that we find "Here stand I, I can no other" (p. 27), and "Who loves not woman, wine and song" (p. 202), relegated to the apocrypha of history.

Boehmer's book may best be described as a collection of critical essays or studies in the life of Luther: yet from these six essays there does emerge a vivid portrait of the "preacher, spiritual pastor, and religious writer" (p. 342), "the prophet of a new religious outlook and the creator of new moral ideals" (p. 264); and although the book is not intended as an introduction to the study of Luther and his times, it is indispensable as a companion to that study. It illuminates the whole field; there are some careful pages on the iconography of Luther, and on his influence on the development of the German language and of church music; the account of his political and social theory (pp. 287-8) is admirable; and all six essays are full of entertaining scraps of information, such as the fact that Luther had a figure of the Madonna and Child in his own home (p. 168), and that he was confident that there would be dogs in Heaven (p. 231 n.). But on nothing is Boehmer so admirable as on the incompatibility of the spirit of Erasmus with that of the Reformation. Erasmus, with his "philosophy of Christ"—"a moralism dressed up to pass for Christianity . . . derived from . . . Cicero and Seneca" (p. 259)—with his simple faith in *autarkeia*, Providence, and rewards and punishments beyond the grave—is exposed as, in the last analysis, an *anima naturaliter pagana*, the heir of Pelagianism, and the prophet or precursor of that Neo-Stoicism which is the official religion of the vast majority of English public schools. The analysis of what "religion" meant to Luther (pp. 267-8), coupled with the sneer on p. 313 at "Anglo-American cant" with its reverence for "the outward show of Christianity," is also illuminating: nothing reveals so clearly how Protestantism has come full cycle, and fallen back in our own time on justification by works without faith, or at least without adherence to any formal creed or cultus. Boehmer had his prejudices: he disliked asceticism and democracy and Melanchthon—in fact, he pays a startling tribute to "the Croat Matthias Flacius Illynicus" as "the still unrecognized saviour of Lutheranism from the catholicizing efforts of Melanchthon and the Philippists" (p. 200): but perhaps those prejudices are not the least illuminating feature of this illuminating study of Luther and the Reformation in the light of modern research.

C. C. H. SMYTH.

JESUS CHRIST: HIS PERSON, HIS MESSAGE, HIS CREDENTIALS. By
Leonce de Grandmaison, S.J. Translated by Dom. Basil Whelan.
Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

This is the first volume of a book which represents the culmination of the life-work of a famous French Jesuit. Interesting and valuable as this volume is, those that follow it will be found to contain matter which is

still more original and important. This volume deals with the sources for Christian history and its background, subjects with regard to which there is not much room for originality. This book is admirably proportioned and quite up to date. An especially interesting and exceptional feature is the liberal use that the author makes of English books while not neglecting those produced in other countries. It is not primarily an apologetic book, but a plain and full statement of the facts relating to the history of Jesus Christ written by a man who is himself a thorough believer in the full Catholic Creed, but who is able and willing to examine with singular impartiality all that can be said in criticism of this Creed and its antecedents.

No Anglican Churchman need shrink from buying this book on the ground that it may appeal to an authority which he does not recognize.

The authorities appealed to are well authenticated tradition and common sense, and we are acquainted with no book which is such an admirable antidote to the many ill-founded theories which are now spread about by a shallow and irresponsible criticism.

The section devoted to Christian sources begins with an examination of the Pauline Epistles, thus setting the whole matter in true perspective.

The author points out that St. Paul's mysticism caused him to pass lightly over the facts of the life of Christ between His birth and His death, not because he was ignorant of them, but because they did not take a prominent part in the scheme of thought which inspired such of his writings as have come down to us. This idea he illustrated by a remarkable simile:

"Even as a mighty wave surges over the seashore, submerging the roughnesses, smoothening out the delicate outlines, effacing the picturesque details, and finally letting nothing emerge save only the points of the rocks which mark out the dominant lines, so the theological vision of the Apostle has engulfed in the life of the Word made flesh everything which is not the indispensable foundation of redemption."

He also deals admirably with 2 Cor. v. 14-18, that fragile basis on which so much Modernist theology has been built.

With regard to the origin of the Gospels the theories of the *Formgeschichte* school are faithfully dealt with and there is an impressive note on the theory of the Creative Community. With regard to this attempt to break the Gospels up into literary atoms, Father de Grandmaison says, "A body stretched on a dissecting table is one thing and a living man is another." And again, "The Gospels are less apologies than Epiphanies."

He emphasizes the Hebraic character of the First Gospel and its literary finish and completeness. He believes in the tradition of its priority and thinks that the translator of the Aramaic original knew how to avail himself of the framework and the phrases into which Mark had cast the oral teaching of St. Peter. The fundamental identity of the apostolic teaching must not, in his opinion, be overlooked, and it must be remembered that Matthew drew up not his personal reminiscences, but that teaching in which St. Peter had a prominent part.

This Gospel, he says, "replies to the questions which a Palestinian Jew of the period before the great catastrophe of A.D. 70 would naturally put to himself on the person of Jesus, the essentials of His message and the reception given to this message by Israel."

Of the Second Gospel he says: "We have here no careful narrative, . . . but a series of concrete facts . . . living words crudely related

without any care to prevent wrong glosses. It is an epitome: an *aide mémoire* for the missionary. It is enough for the author to display Jesus. The words of the Master carry their own weight and His actions manifest Him."

In an admirable paragraph on the Third Gospel he points out how far it is reasonable to expect to find Paulinism in it: "We must distinguish between St. Paul's original contribution to the edifice (of his theology), and that which is only original in the manner of its presentation. . . . We cannot expect to find in a Gospel anything but preparatory statements . . . those things which base it on the message of Christ. And this is what we actually do find in St. Luke's book."

The section dealing with the Fourth Gospel is the weakest in the book and is especially weak in its treatment of the theory that Papias stated that the Apostle John had been put to death by the Jews. The author considers, however, that the authorship of the Gospel by the son of Zebedee is the most probable solution of the problem. He, however, plays with the suggestion that the Apostle was helped by a secretary in this work, which, however popular it may be, remains a pure conjecture, especially when the secretary is supposed to have been the elusive "John the Elder."

Father de Grandmaison makes the strange slip of stating that Dionysius of Alexandria believed in the existence of this person.

The volume ends with an admirable chapter on the political, intellectual and religious conditions of the Judea into which Jesus came.

The section on the apocalyptic literature is particularly good.

There are also important appendices on Josephus, the Creative Community, the Rhythms and Oral Style of the New Testament and the relationship between the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel.

The translation is readable and flowing, though in one place on page 159 it seems to misrepresent the original rather seriously.

The translator says, "That is why the Fourth Gospel adds to our scrappy information so very little on the framework, the chronology and the Jewish portions of our Lord's activities."

The French is, "C'est pourquoi, en ce qui touche le cadre, la chronologie et les parties Judéennes de l'activité de Jésus, le quatrième évangile apporte à notre information, si lacunaire, d'inappréciables compléments."

H. P. V. NUNN.

THE TWO KINGDOMS. Essays by Six Priests. Alexander Ouseley, Limited. 6s.

This book contains a series of eight essays by Roman Catholic priests, with a preface by Cardinal Bourne. Founded on the teaching of St. Augustine in his *De Civitate Dei*, the book treats of the relation of the Church to the world with special reference to the problems of today and tomorrow. The first essay deals with the hostility of the world to the Church. Here and throughout the book the word "Church" means the Roman Catholic Church, and the term "world" appears to include everything outside the Church, including other religious bodies. The Reformation, in the view of the essayist, "marks the beginning of a gradual process of dechristianization, in which some see the fulfilment of the prophecy of the unloosing of Satan" (pp. 14, 15). The other essays are on the Church and Civilization, the Church and the State, the Church and Society,

the Church and the Modern Mind, and the Church and Heathendom, together with essays on the Outlook and the Consummation. In the essay on the Church and the Modern Mind the writer, with a fine impartiality, attacks unbelief, Modernism and Anglo-Catholicism. His remedy for all the difficulties and perplexities of today is the Authority of the Church. The writer of the essay on Heathendom makes the remarkable admission that "Protestant" missionary work is better organized and financed than that of his own Church (p. 169).

The whole book is frankly, and rather narrowly, Roman. Underlying it throughout is the idea that only "the Church" can successfully cope with the world—the Kingdom of Antichrist. If we cannot admit this, or the conclusion (in the essay entitled "The Consummation," p. 195), that for the real unification of the world there must be a universal (Roman Catholic) Church, we can at any rate make our own the words of St. Augustine with which the book ends: "Quis alius noster est finis nisi pervenire ad regnum cuius nullus est finis?" (*De Civit. Dei*, xxii. 30).

H. W. FULFORD.

THE NEW COMMANDMENT. An Inquiry into the Social Precept and Practice of the Ancient Church. By C. S. Phillips, D.D. S.P.C.K. 6s.

This is a careful study of the social life of the early Church in (a) the Apostolic Age, (b) before Constantine, (c) during the rest of the fourth century. The author deals with such questions as the case of "widows and orphans," the organization of Church funds and alms, the bearing upon communal life of Eucharistic belief, the Church's attitude towards secular government, property and slavery, the raising of ethical standards concerning child exposure, the care of the sick, the treatment of prisoners, and lastly the ending of gladiatorial sports.

There might have been added some reference to the Church's influence in the raising of the status of women, which, to us now, is one of the vital social questions. Dr. Phillips deals with the question of property, on which the late Charles Marson was a great authority and published an article, now long out of print, in *Vox Clamantium* (1894).

The present author quotes the Fathers to show the strongly communistic trend of their teaching. But he concludes that, heartfelt as their utterances were, they represented a tendency called forth to rebuke selfishness in the use of property rather than a complete determination of the mind of the Church in favour of communism as such. In regard to slavery, the Church never formally condemned it, but mitigated its evils, and, by the implication of her Faith, instilled such conceptions of human nature that, at last—a very long last—the institution became outworn.

The effect upon human progress of the recognition of the Christian Religion by the Empire under and after Constantine is summed up very sadly by Dr. Phillips as follows:

"Thus, from the point of view of the establishment of a better social order the Christianization of the Empire must be written down a failure" (p. 137).

The general effect of the book leaves a chastened feeling as to the actual amount and intensity of the Church's influence upon the world in the first four centuries. Even allowing for the best that can be claimed, how very far short of promise it was. Yet the vastness of the problem of converting ancient civilization, and the admittedly supernatural con-

ceptions involved in the Faith, so far beyond the reach of "the natural man," must be allowed due weight. The Church, as the organ of the Kingdom of God, had to face the building of "a new heaven and a new earth." It may be that what she did accomplish, taking into account all the facts, is more important than what she did not. But this conclusion is no excuse for complacency amongst us today. Even admitting the need for "a change of heart," the modern Church should be far more active and aggressive in the cause of social righteousness than is actually the case. It is in the very conception of this side of the Church's function where the rebuke of our slackness lies, and Dr. Phillips does the best service in calling our attention to it. He quotes Dr. Hort's well-known passage: "Ideally the Ecclesia was co-extensive with humanity: all who shared the manhood which Christ had taken were potentially members of the Ecclesia: its ideals were identical with the ideals of a cleansed and purified humanity."

P. STACY.

ENLIGHTENMENT AND SALVATION. By R. M. Shaw, B.D. Williams and Norgate, Ltd. 7s. 6d.

A comparative study of the great religions of the world in a book of little more than 150 pages is bound to be incomplete, and is perhaps only made possible by limiting its scope to some element common to all religions. Along this line, this book strikes one as being a successful attempt to show how the teaching given in the various religious systems about "the satisfaction which the soul desires," and the means by which man may attain that satisfaction, divides them into two great groups. On one hand, the religions rising among the Aryan peoples—Brahmanism, Buddhism—conceive of "salvation as equivalent to enlightenment," the soul of man being sunk in ignorance and error; on the other hand, the religions characteristic of the Semitic races—Judaism, Christianity, Islam—reckon "enlightenment as equivalent to salvation," and the chief foe of man as sin and his own evil will. In the first group it is taught that Enlightenment may be attained by man's unceasing effort; in the second, salvation, though the content of this word differs, is regarded as the gift of God: the first group may be called "religions of knowledge"; the second, "religions of revelation," and Christianity alone, without denying its real nature, can claim to be first the religion of inspiration and then of knowledge.

This general conclusion follows a short and very lucid account of the teaching on which each of the great religions is based, and students will be grateful for the clearness with which the intellectual position of each with regard to these fundamental questions is explained. The coldly logical impression given by the study of Christianity will probably remind him that such an exposition is a contribution only, not an attempt to provide adequate material for a just comparison of the value and strength of these religious systems.

K. M. TANQUERAY.

INDIA'S RELIGION OF GRACE AND CHRISTIANITY. By R. Otto: Translated by F. H. Foster, D.D. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

Professor Otto has set himself to consider whether there exists among the religions and theological speculations of India a "competitor of Christianity": that is a competitor in showing us the "way" to salvation.

The result, as his translator truly remarks in a preface, is that "this book contains a most remarkable and perhaps startling disclosure of a true 'religion of grace' in that ancient land."

Special opportunities for study and discussion with leading Indian scholars have equipped Professor Otto to give a full and most sympathetic account of the bhakti-religion in India, chiefly as it is practised by the followers of Vishnu, and he shows that from the Gita onwards there has existed a protest against that form of belief which in the West is still reckoned most typically Indian—"the monistic mysticism of an impersonal Absolute." Like Christianity, the bhakti-religion, especially as set forth in the teaching of Ramanuja (A.D. 1100) offers salvation, not only to the wise, but to all, the salvation which comes through loving surrender (bhakti) to the "Lord," and is the fruit, not of the toil of good works, but of the saving might of the Lord. This protest, for which Professor Otto claims that it began in pre-Christian times and is a distinctively Indian growth, has attacked and solved in its own way many of the problems faced by the Christian Church; the question regarding faith and works, the method of co-operation between man and God, the contest between the "world-denying" and the "world-affirming" attitude, and it is true that some of its adherents, both in India and Japan, claim that their thought of God differs little from that of Christians. This the author strenuously denies, and after giving examples of Indians, both Christian and Hindu, who object to such syncretism, shows how alien to Indian thought is the Christian teaching of God's purpose, of this world as the sphere of our service to Him, and of the Kingdom of God in which His purpose is to be realized.

Sympathetic understanding of the Indian position combined with clear-sighted, unwavering loyalty to the Christian revelation have combined to make this book a striking and stimulating contribution to a better understanding of the ways in which God has revealed Himself to man.

K. M. TANQUERAY.

THE CATHOLIC STUDENTS' "AIDS" TO THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE: VOL. II.
THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Fr. Hugh Pope. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 7s. 6d.

This is a commentary on the Old Testament according to the Roman Canon. Fr. Pope has done his work carefully and well. The book is learned, clear, and packed with information. Each book of the Bible receives separate treatment. There is, in each case, a full Introduction, a brief analysis, short notes on passages not dealt with in ordinary commentaries, and a good Bibliography, patristic and modern. The author accepts the decision of the Papal Biblical Commission on the historic character of the early chapters of Genesis and the writing of Isaiah. But on these and other cases in which he differs from what are usually regarded as the assured conclusions of modern Old Testament criticism he is careful to give the arguments for the views opposed to his own. An Index and maps add to the value of a volume which may be consulted with advantage by students, whether they are Roman Catholics or not.

H. W. FULFORD.